12 D. 4

DISCOURSES

ON SEVERAL

Important Subjects.

By the Late REVEREND

DANIEL WILLIAMS, D. D.

Publiſhed ſingly by HIMSELF, and now collected by the Appointment of his Will.

VOL. IV.

3 L k

LONDON:

Printed by JAMES WAUGH, at the *Turk's Head*, in *Lombard-Street*.

MDCCL.

19

DISCOURSES

ON SEVERAL

Important Subjects.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

Published singly by Himself, and now collected
by the Appointment of his Will.

VOL. IV.

LONDON:

Printed by James Watson, at the Printing Press
in Lombard Street.

MDCCLX.

THE CONTENTS OF THE FOURTH VOLUME.

21. MAN *made righteous by Christ's Obedience*; being two Sermons at *Pinners Hall*, with Enlargements, &c. To which is added, A Reply to Mr. *Mather*'s Poſtſcript. 1694. Pag. 1.

22. AN Anſwer to Mr. *John Humfrey*'s ſecond printed Letter, wherein he publiſheth Mr. *Lobb*'s Objections againſt Mr. *Williams*'s Books. 1695. Pag. 285.

23. THE *Anſwer to the Report, &c.* which the United Miniſters appointed their Committee to draw up: Alſo *Letters* of the *Biſhop of Worceſter*, and Dr. *Edwards*, to Mr. *Williams*, againſt whom their Teſtimony was produced by Mr. *Lobb*: And Animad-

CONTENTS.

Animadverſions on Mr. *Lobb*'s Defence of *the Report*. 1698. Pag. 309.

24. A POSTSCRIPT added to the Third Edition of *Goſpel-Truth ſtated &c.* for clearing ſundry Truths objected againſt, *&c.* 1698. Pag. 465.

ERRATA.

Pag. iii. l. 22. already r. always. p. 130. l. 29. r. Conſequence p. 145. title, r. *Faith.*

Man made Righteous

BY

Chriſt's Obedience:

BEING TWO

SERMONS

AT

PINNERS-HALL,

With Enlargements, *&c.*

ALSO SOME

Remarks on Mr. *Mather*'s Poſtſcript, *&c.*

Printed in the Year 1694.

Man made Righteous

BY

Christ's Obedience:

BEING TWO

SERMONS

AT

PLUMBERS-HALL,

With Enlargements, &c.

ALSO SOME

Remarks on Mr. Marlow's Pamphlet, &c.

Printed in the Year 1694.

IN a paper ſigned by *Geo. Griffith, Tho. Cole, Nath. Mather, Jſ. Chauncy, Rob. Trayl, Rich. Taylor*; and ſince printed by Mr. *Chauncy, Neonom. unmaſk'd, part* iii. *pag.* 96. they charge me, "He teacheth, "*That the righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed* "*only as to effects, with a purchaſe of a* "*conditional grant, viz. this Propoſition,* "*He that believeth ſhall be ſaved.* Goſpel-"Truth, *pag.* 43, 44."

My words there are theſe: "*The differ-*"*rence is not,* 4. Whether Chriſt by his "righteouſneſs merited for all the Elect, "that they ſhould in his time and way *be* "*certainly partakers* of its ſaving effects; "and did not only purchaſe a conditional "grant of thoſe effects, *viz.* this Propoſi-"tion, *He that believeth ſhall be ſaved.* "5. Nor whether, beſides theſe effects "being made ours, the very righteouſneſs "of Chriſt is imputed to true believers, as "what was already undertaken and de-"ſigned for their ſalvation, and is now "effectual to their actual pardon and ac-"ceptance to life; yea, is pleadable by "them as their ſecurity, and is as uſeful "to their happineſs, as if they themſelves "had done and ſuffered what Chriſt did. "All theſe I affirm." *Pag.* 43, 44.

CAN any thing be more contrary? They ſay I affirm, what I do expreſsly deny; and that I deny, what I expreſsly affirm.

Mr. *Mather*, in the *Poſtſcript* to his two *Sermons* on *the Righteouſneſs of God through Faith*, &c. *pag.* 72. ſaith, "My damning "Error is, *He is one, that makes union to* "*Chriſt, our having this righteouſneſs upon* "*us, and our being juſtified by it, to be* "*given us in way of Reward of ſomething* "*done by us.*"

My only words, to which he twice refers, are theſe, "Goſpel-benefits are no re- "ward of Debt; and yet they are given in "a way of Reward: The benefits are given, "not *for* our Faith, yet upon believing; not "upon it as a meriting conſideration, yet "upon it as *that* the preſence whereof is "made neceſſary by the Goſpel, this having "required Faith, and confined the benefit "to him that believes." *Defence of Goſpel-Truth, pag.* 362. Theſe and other imputations I have ſpoke to.

You ſee, I ſay only *benefits* indefinitely: The thing done by us here, is only *believing*: And *in way of Reward*, is only in performance of a Goſpel-promiſe, made to encourage and move Sinners to believe.

TO

TO THE READER.

IT is fit, that God (whose we are) should use us to his own Purposes, however unagreeable to our inclinations the Work is, or however mysterious the Design of Providence be at present. I am sure, Peace is my delightful pursuit, though unreasonable men force me to Debates, as part of my employ. The several Books written, and Sermons studiously preached for Antinomianism, had not engaged my Pen at first, if the Leaven had not spread to the open censure of the usefullest Ministry as legal, to the hazard of the Souls and Peace of our Congregations, and to the common reproach of the Dissenters.

When a Testimony by Gospel-Truth stated was published, I resolved to cease any further progress in this affair; being assured it was sufficient to inform such as were not given up to those delusions, against which only it was designed. But Mr. Chauncy's notorious misrepresentations of my Principles, necessitated

my Defence of Goſpel-truth, *when his* Billingſgate *Language would have been wholly ſlighted. Since then he hath publiſhed three Books, unworthy of my regard; being he was reſolved to perſiſt in miſtaking the matters in debate, and muſt argue in a way I was ſure the Judicious would contemn; and only ſuch Simple ones be confirmed thereby, who had no Liſt or Patience to read an Anſwer. He was followed by one Mr.* Edwards, *a man even of far leſs Judgment and equal Violence; two Pages of whoſe Book aſſured me, that reading further, was only to view an emblem of Hell,* viz. *hot Fire and thick Darkneſs. His Name-ſake, the learned Author of* Criſpianiſm unmaſk'd, *treated his Anſwer thereto, with the ſame due Pity as I have done. The* War among the Angels *alſo was written with an air of ſuch falſhood and profaneneſs, as cautioned any from anſwering it, who had not the like* freedom *to form an* Antinomian *Prayer. That unchriſtian Spirit all theſe men diſcover, is convictive that Chriſt employs them not.*

The fury and arts of the Promoters and Abetters of their new Goſpel *(without precepts or threatnings) appearing a publick damage, as they unſeaſonably divided the* Nonconformiſts, *rendred me induſtrious to allay the Heats; but I ſoon found, that ſuch as oppoſed the* Union *at firſt, would not quit the occaſion they had framed, to keep up a Faction oppoſite thereto. Hence, though we*

got

we got them to ſubſcribe with us an Agreement in Doctrines, *and therein we mutually engaged to be at Peace, and not expoſe each other; it was not three weeks, e'er new Books were publiſhed, and their Pulpits (without any provocation on our parts) filled with the former railings; reckoning, it ſeems, themſelves at liberty, becauſe they judged we thought ourſelves obliged by our Subſcriptions to be ſilent.*

I, for the publick good, connived at this, and at Mr. Cole's *violent cenſures and miſrepreſentations of our judgment at* Pinners-Hall *near twelve Months, without the leaſt return; till at laſt, in a Sermon there, he proclaimed,* "*That* Goſpel-Truth ſtated "*was juſt the Caſe of the Parable of the* "Phariſee." *I thought it my duty, to ſhew in my next turn, in the calmeſt words, that* Goſpel-Truth ſtated *agreed in nothing with the* Phariſee; *and was quarrelled with, only becauſe it urged the imitation of the* Publican *in his penitent Humiliation as neceſſary to Forgiveneſs, (which that Brother conſtantly exclaims againſt,) and I urged the neceſſity of an end to contentions. I medled not again, and forbore expoſing his myſterious Nonſenſe, which his Books as well as Sermons miniſtred ſufficient advantage for; though, alas, he and his Party (I know not why,) judge once* vindicating *ourſelves from falſe aſperſions, is an intolerable Crime in me, when his frequent, and weak as well as paſſionate Outcries, are*

very juſtifiable, even though he ſtill imputes to us what we abhor.

For ſome time we were quiet, and it was my hope we ſhould continue ſo; but Mr. Mather, *the great Enemy to the* Union, *finding he could no longer inſtigate others to blow the flames, finds an occaſion to get into* Pinners-Hall, *upon the Sickneſs of one of the ſix Lecturers; and there,* as he owneth in his Preface, *ſtudiouſly and of purpoſe renews the Debate. Mr.* Baxter *and I were oft as good as named by him, and the very body of our Miniſters arraigned as* Socinians, *and by him charged as holding ſoul-deſtroying Errors, if there be, or ever were, any in the world, as Enemies to Chriſt's righteouſneſs at heart, and worſe than Papiſts; with the like envenomed Reproaches. And with the reſt of his Stuff, he, under pain of* Damnation, *required the people to believe, that* Chriſt's incarnation was no part of his Humiliation, *and* every Believer was as righteous as Chriſt in Equality, *and not in Similitude only; with other things, which the following Tract inſiſts on. Theſe he had oft in his own place preached, and long endeavoured to make our Miniſtry hateful to his Hearers; yet that I was ſilent under: But ſerious thoughts of the deſign and tendency of his open attempt at* Pinners-Hall, *forced me in my next turns in that Lecture, to preach the principal Heads of the following Sermons, which I enlarged into four Diſcourſes at my own place. Yet I had that re-*

gard

gard to Peace, that as I forbore all indecent Reflections, ſo I took no notice that any one aſſerted what I determine againſt; and had never publiſhed them, except that he had printed his, and that with the ſcandalous name he intends us to be called hereafter by, viz. Semi-Socinian.

Sober men juſtly cry out againſt theſe Debates; but I appeal to their conſciences, where the Blame muſt be laid? Can we be faithful to Chriſt, to our Miniſtry, to Souls that need our help, or to our own Name, as Miniſters, if we lye down with theſe calumnies and miſrepreſentations? Though did they only plead for their own Whimſies, I ſhould for Peace diſregard them; but to make it their daily work to prejudice the People againſt the faithfuleſt Miniſtry, and run them into confuſion of mind for a Faction's ſake, calls I think for an induſtrious Oppoſition.

If you aſk, what in us is it, that they ſo exclaim againſt? I anſwer, It is, (1.) *That tho' we own Chriſt's righteouſneſs is truly imputed to us, yet we deny that God eſteems us to have done and ſuffered what Chriſt did.* (2.) *Tho' we own, that God requires nothing of us to be a meriting legal Righteouſneſs, or Atonement for Sin; yet we ſay, that God in a way of governing Grace, requires ſome Duty to be performed on man's part, (to which he enableth us,) whereupon he applies to us the beneficial effects and fruits of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, according to the reſpective Goſpel-*

Promiſes;

Promiſes; and thereby encourageth us to thoſe Duties, and governs our fears and hopes. And this is the Heart of the Controverſy; for they think no Duty, as a Duty, is ordained a means to any benefit: They own no Law, but the Law of Works, which admitted nothing ſhort of perfect ſinleſs obedience: And becauſe we cannot perform that, as the meriting Condition of Life in the adjuſtment of Juſtice; therefore men muſt do nothing, as a Condition of enjoying any benefits in Chriſt's right, by the adjuſtment of Grace in a way of authority: Since we cannot be wholly Sinleſs, it's all as one whether we are Sincere or no. (3.) *We own, that it is Faith alone is the receiving Condition of Juſtification; yea I add, That it's the only expreſs'd Condition of the Imputation of Chriſt's righteouſneſs in order to pardon: But all is in vain, becauſe we ſay that Repentance is neceſſary to our actual pardon.*

Mr. Mather *falſly pretends, that their Notions are the Truth in the Churches poſſeſſion ſince the Reformation. But I have proved the contrary by many Quotations in my* Defence of Goſpel-Truth; *and the very judicious and learned* Apology *of the Subſcribers of my Book hath added a greater number. I will, of Hundreds I could produce, give two Teſtimonies.*

The one is Mr. Perkins, *in his* Order and Cauſes of Salvation, *&c. Chap.* 36. "*Queſt.* "Whether is juſtifying Faith commanded

"in

" in the Law? *Anſ.* It is commanded " in the Law of Faith, namely the Goſ- " pel, but not in the Law of Works, that " is, in the Moral Law, *Rom.* iii. 27." *The Reaſons are theſe*, " 1. That which the " Law revealeth not, that it commandeth " not; but the Law is ſo far from reveal- " ing juſtifying Faith, that it never knew " it. 2. *Adam* had fully before his Fall " written in his heart the Moral Law, yet " had he not juſtifying Faith which ap- " prehended Chriſt." *He then proceeds to anſwer the Objections againſt the Goſpel being a Law.*

The other is Mr. Anth. Burgeſs, *in his* Doctrine of Juſtification, *part* 1. *pag.* 161. *who denies, that* Repentance is in a man, as a Sign only that God hath pardoned him: *But ſaith*, " We muſt go further, and ſay, " it's the Means and Way which God hath " appointed antecedently to Pardon, ſo that " where this goeth before, the other fol- " loweth after." *This he proves by ſix Arguments, and the Book was printed at the deſire of the* London *Synod.*

To theſe I ſhall only add, that Calvin *oft owneth the Goſpel to be* a Law, *and in his Commentaries on* Jonah, *Cap.* iii. 10. *pag.* 359. *ſaith*, " Forgiveneſs is free, and yet as oft " as God propoſeth Forgiveneſs to Sinners, " this Condition is ſtill added therewith, " *viz.* that they repent." *He gives the Reaſons of it, and ca'ls it* a Law, *by which God com-*

commands Repentance in order to Pardon, though not as a cauſe of Pardon.

I have in this Book endeavoured to put the doctrine of Juſtification in a plain light; though I wonder why our Brethren ſtill ſay, I mean what is quite contrary to what I ſay. I ſuppoſe, it's becauſe they have ſo long thought and repreſented ſome of our Principles contrary to what they be, that they cannot think it poſſible that they ſhould be what indeed they are; or at leaſt they will ſuſpect us Fools and Lyars, *rather than ſeem to own that they could be ſo long miſtaken. I requeſt therefore, that if Mr.* Mather *will reply to me, he would cite my words fully, and give the Page as I have done, for hitherto my own words would have put their Calumnies to Shame: Him, while God ſpares me, I will attend to. He ſaith,* "*That he is* "*not far from the place,* where the weary "are at reſt, and the wicked ceaſe from "troubling." *I wiſh him Repentance of the wound he hath unjuſtly given ſo many, fitter to ſerve their Generation than him or me; and whilſt he is ſpared, (which I deſire for Service may be long,) that he may be leſs* unwearied *in hindring and breaking that bleſſed* Union, *which promiſed ſo much Good; though I am ſorry, he boaſts of his own* Quietneſs, *while he createth broils and diſquiet to ſo many: Some known to us both, he'll meet in Glory, who were comforted by the above Conſideration, whilſt leſs able to bear up under*

his

his assaults, than by Grace I have been long strengthened to do. Nevertheless, whilst Conscience binds me to some Sharpness against his attempt to destroy so many Ministers, as to what is more valuable than their Lives; I do from my Heart forgive him, and would rejoice to find him convinced of his mistake and misrepresentation of our Principles, that we might peaceably concur in promoting the Kingdom of Christ and our common Good, and not be the Scorn of such as glory in our Weakness.

Reader, *It's worth thy notice, that there is more Safety in our way, than in the contrary; for we trust in Christ's only Righteousness for all those things and uses it is appointed to, even for Satisfaction to Justice, the Pardon of all our sins and defects, the Acceptance of our persons and all performances, the Merit of all Good, yea, and our legal and prolegal Righteousness, renouncing every Grace and Work of ours to any of these purposes: And this is all they pretend. But if it prove, that Christ never intended his Righteousness to be instead of true Faith and Repentance, sincere Love to God and Men, and Perseverance in true Holiness and Fruitfulness; and that Christ will judge us according to these, as things he required to our actual enjoying of promised Benefits in his Righteousness; they who pursue and by Grace have these, will be* safer *than such as neglect them; yea, Mr.* Mather *owneth, pag.* 67. "Such

"are

" are thy bounden Duties, and God will " damn thee for neglecting them." *It were eaſy to ſhew, how theſe Men contradict each other as well as themſelves; but I forbear expoſing them. That the Father of Light and Love would guide all of us into the way of Truth and Peace, is the unfeigned Prayer of*

Thy Servant in the Kingdom
and Patience of Chriſt,

D. WILLIAMS.

ANY who conſider what men I have to deal with, will excuſe my frequent Repetitions, and ſometimes leſs accurate words, as *object* for *ſubject*, when I would moſt plainly diſtinguiſh between juſtifying Righteouſneſs, with its cauſes, and the Perſon partaker of it.

SER-

SERMON I.

Of Christ's Obedience.

Rom. v. *the last part of the* 19*th Verse.*

——*So by the Obedience of One shall many be made righteous.*

THE Text represents to us, *First*, A saving privilege and dignity: *Made righteous*. It supposes us unrighteous, ere we are made righteous; and so, subject to the Curse, till we are absolved, as well as disobedient to the Gospel while unconverted. The Word καταστάθησονται, oft, though not always, denotes an act of Authority; as *Mat.* xxv. 21. *Luke* xii. 14, 42. *Acts* vi. 3, *&c.* and thus it's properly enough applicable to the Matter before us. We are *constituted righteous* Juridically, and all other benefits included here in the term *righteous*, are authoritatively conferred; and this according to a Divine enacted Constitution: of which hereafter.

SERM. I.

Secondly,

SERM. I. *Secondly*, THE ſole procuring Cauſe of our being made righteous: It's *by the Obedience of One*. This One is the Lord Jeſus. He alone was capable to make fallen men righteous by his Obedience, and it's *by his Obedience* that Sinners are conſtituted righteous. Mercy prompted the recovery of miſerable man: Wiſdom contrived this, as a way ſufficient, effectual, and congruous, to that end; God, as our Judge and Ruler, admitted and accepted this, and in his adjuſted way applies it for our pardon and adoption. Faith is the moral Inſtrument or Condition of that application; the Goſpel-Promiſe is the expreſs Sign of the Divine Will, or the Inſtrument whereby God doth apply it: But the different Intereſt of each of theſe prevents not the appropriation of all the Cauſal Merit to this Obedience. God juſtifies, regenerates, and ſaves, but it's with an Eye to this, as the only procuring Cauſe.

Thirdly, THE Subject actually partaker of this bleſſing: *Many*. They are Men, and not Devils; fallen Men, and not innocent: *Many*, and not ſimply *few*; nor yet *all*; though it's for final impenitency and unbelief that any of the ſons of men remain condemned. Theſe *many* are equal to the number of godly believers in all ages.

Fourthly, THE futurity and certainty of many being made righteous; both which the

the Future Tense imports: *Shall be* made righteous. SERM. I.

1. IT denotes *futurity*. With respect to the effect of *Adam*'s Sin it's said, κατεστάθησαν ἁμαρτωλοι, they *were made Sinners*: There is guilt entailed on all his seed, and filth derived to them as soon as they subsist; yea, it is true, they were all offenders, and corrupted in *Adam*, as being seminally in him. But by Christ's Obedience, it's affirmed, many *shall be made* righteous; that is, when it is applied, and not before.

THE Elect since Christ's time, *remain unrighteous* whilst unbelievers, notwithstanding that Christ's Obedience is long since finished; as well as all believers before Christ's coming *were made righteous* by this Obedience, tho' it was not then actually performed. The reason of both is the same, *viz.* That we are *made righteous*, not immediately in the moment of Christ's obeying, nor merely on the Acts done; but upon God's applying this to us by the word of his Gospel, and the work of his Spirit. Therefore believing *Abraham* was *made righteous* many ages before Christ obeyed; and the Elect *Corinthians* were *unjustified* all the time of their infidelity, tho' Christ had finished his work before. The Gospel-Promise confers righteousness for Justification on all believers, and none but believers; tho' Christ's Obedience be that, for which alone, when they believe, any are

Heb. xi. 13.

Rom. iv. 22.

1 Cor. vi. 11.

SERM. I. juſtified. This Righteouſneſs is offered to all hearers on the terms of the Goſpel; it's deſigned infallibly for all the Elect: But neither offer, nor deſign, conſtitutes any man righteous. There muſt be another act, (even imputation,) and that terminates on no other object but the believer.

2. THE words denote *certainty*; as if it were ſaid, many *ſhall* eventually be made righteous by it. A *may be* made righteous, if they will believe, is a Mercy to Mankind above Devils: But a mere *may be* is too low a reward for Chriſt, and incongruous to an Obedience ſo aſtoniſhing. Strange were it, that the Lord of Life ſhould die for Sinners, and it remain contingent, whether any of them ſhould eternally ſpeak his praiſes, or be happy by his merits. But my Text is an unerring prediction, which will be ſtill accompliſhing, till Chriſt ſhall judge the world: *His ſeed he ſhall ſee*, whom *by his knowledge he will juſtify*. He will not violate the Goſpel-conſtitution, by juſtifying the unbeliever, becauſe he is elected; but the Elect ſhall believe, that they may be juſtified by his Obedience. The eternal Counſel ſhall be executed, in the way enacted by governing Grace. But we have further in the Text,

Iſa. liii. 10, 11.

Fifthly, THE redditive note, which refers to the firſt clauſe of the verſe; ουτω, *So*. The Apoſtle had ſaid, *As by one man's Diſobedience many were made Sinners*; *So*, &c.

He

He principally intends hereby to affirm, That by *Christ's* Obedience all his regenerate ſeed ſhall as certainly be made righteous, as *Adam's* natural ſeed were made Sinners by his Diſobedience: *Chriſt's obedience* is as effectual to the one, as *Adam's diſobedience* was to the other. *Adam* is ſaid to be *the Figure* of Chriſt, *ver.* 14. They were two publick Perſons in this reſpect. All men were made Sinners by *Adam's* Fall; all men that ever are made righteous, are made ſo by *Chriſt's* Obedience. This is the main ſcope of the Apoſtle's reaſoning, in the parallel between the Firſt and Second *Adam*: But he intends not to infer a Similitude in all things between *Chriſt* and *Adam*, who in ſo many things differ; nay, in this Chapter you have ſundry inſtances of that difference given. SERM. I.

Doct. *By the Obedience of Jeſus Chriſt, God-Man our Redeemer, many ſhall be made righteous.*

GOOD News to a loſt world! that tho' we are undone as *Adam's* poſterity, yet *help is laid on* Chriſt, *who is mighty to ſave.* There's a way to reſcue us *out of the pit, wherein is no water*, and to releaſe us from that Slavery, which as to any thing in our power or purchaſe muſt have eternally continued. But what comfort doth it miniſter to Sinners, that the Goſpel proclaims a Pſ. lxxxix. 19. Zech. ix. 11.

SERM. I.

way to be made righteous on its terms, a way to be made obedient to thoſe terms; and a certainty, that many of us apoſtates, forlorn wretches, ſhall infallibly be *made righteous* in that way? Nor doth it a little contribute to our joy, that it is by Chriſt's Obedience all this is effected: This gives the ſtrongeſt ſecurity, and muſt infer the benefits to be exceeding glorious, when the Price is ſo invaluable, which was paid by him who is Wiſdom itſelf. Yea, we, ſince Chriſt's reſurrection, have the advantage above the Old-Teſtament Saints, that we know more of the Obedience and the Perſon rendring it, than they did; yea, and that it is finiſhed: Even all is actually done by him, which the offended Law-giver exacted, as ſatisfactory for the injury done to governing Juſtice by Sin, or which is meritorious of our bleſſedneſs, and of our right to all ſaving benefits. Well might the Angel be the herald of ſuch News, and ſay,

Luk. ii. 10, 11. *Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which ſhall be to all people; for unto you is born this day a Saviour, which is Chriſt the Lord.*

SHOULD I inſiſt on every part of the *Doctrine*, the Diſcourſes would exceed the number I intend. I ſhall therefore confine myſelf to what will naturally fall under theſe two Enquiries.

I. WHAT is the *Obedience of Chriſt*, by which many ſhall be made righteous?

II. WHAT

II. WHAT is it to be *made righteous* by the Obedience of Christ? SERM. I.

I Qu. *What is the Obedience of Christ, by which many shall be made righteous?*

Answ. BY this *Obedience* we are to understand, All that Christ did or suffered in obedience to the Will of God for the salvation of Sinners, either in a way of Satisfaction, or of Merit. It's sum'd up in the solemn Prayer he made to the Father, *I have glorified thee on earth; I have finished the work thou gavest me to do.* The words indeed have the same anticipation, as is in the Lord's Supper; *This is my Body which* is broken *for you*, tho' he was not actually crucified. So here, *I have finished the work*, that is, I am just upon it; and all was performed in a way of obediential subjection; as if he had said, It's what thou gavest me to do, for the display of thy Glory obscur'd by Sin, and for maintaining that Glory in all the blessings thy goodness inclined to bestow on Sinners. The Word in my Text expressing *Obedience* is ὑπακοὴν, and exactly answers to those words of Christ, *He hath opened mine Ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away back: I gave my Back to the smiters*, &c. Joh. xvii. 4. Isa. l. 5, 6.

I SHALL reduce to a few Propositions, what I think explicative of this point.

SERM. I.

Pſal. v. 4, 5. Nah. i. 2, 3.

I *Prop.* GOD is eſſentially juſt: *He hath no pleaſure in wickedneſs.* From the eſſential *Juſtice* of God it is, that there are Laws of Nature, as well as Poſitive Laws. Here the firſt neceſſity of ſatisfaction for Sin, or the certain puniſhment of Sinners, have their riſe; though it is ratified by the Veracity of God, when threatnings are promulgated by him. God admits no violation hereof in any of his Ordinations, but accommodates them thereto; and provides for the Glory thereof, in all the revelations of his Will, and diſpenſations of his Providence.

II *Prop.* GOD was pleaſed eminently to reveal the Glory of his governing *Juſtice*, in the Covenant of Works with innocent man. It is true, his *Holineſs* appeared in the precept, as a rule of manners; and it was of his *Goodneſs*, that God would expreſsly covenant with man by promiſing any reward for Obedience, and increaſe his defence againſt Sin, by pronouncing the threatning.

HE might have left man to that mere Light which Nature afforded, and proceeded only according to that abſolute Dominion which he had over man, as his Creator and Owner. But it pleaſed God to take on him the relation of a Governor, to which he had a right from his Dominion. As a Governor, he enacts the Law of Works, and diſplays his Juſtice in conſti-

tuting

tuting the rule, whereby he would reward and puniſh. Juſtice held the balance in adjuſting the threatning and reward, or this Conſtitution were not a Law of Works, but a Law of Grace; yea, obedient man had not been rewarded for his Obedience, but for ſomewhat elſe; which is contrary to that of the Apoſtle, *Moſes deſcribeth the righteouſneſs which is of the Law, that the man that doth thoſe things, ſhall live by them*; where he infers, that a man's Obedience had been his right to Life; to which add what he elſewhere ſays, *Now to him that worketh, is the reward not reckoned of Grace, but of Debt.* The reward would not only have been ſure from the Truth of God, (which Goſpel-bleſſings are;) but due from the Covenant, as formally legal: It was to be a reward ſtrictly *legal*; as being proportioned and connected by governing Juſtice; which adjudged, the Duty to be done would honour Juſtice, and anſwer the ends of government, to the proportion of the reward, which was promiſed for that duty. Were it not thus, governing Juſtice had no concern in the Law of Works, as to the *premiant* part of the Sanction, but muſt be confined to the *punitive* part alone. It muſt adjuſt the threatned evil in caſe of Sin, but not the reward in caſe of Obedience. Had Juſtice been ſo unconcerned in the rewards, Divine goodneſs might, even in that Law of Works, have promiſed the reward, without

SERM. I.

Rom. x. 5.

Rom. iv. 4.

SERM. I. requiring any duty as the Condition; and consequently, there were no absolute necessity of Christ's meriting glory for us; his mere atonement for Sin being as much as would answer governing Justice, which did not adjust the reward, but the threatning against Sin only; whereas the reward was inserted and proportioned of mere free goodness. This would also weaken the main argument for the necessity of the imputation of Christ's active Obedience, for our title to Glory: For if governing Justice made not man's Obedience a meriting condition of Glory; but that the reward was of mere Grace in that constitution; it is no Violation of Justice, that we have Glory as pardoned Sinners, though Obedience be not imputed to us.

LET us then entertain thoughts of the Law, becoming that account: *The Law is holy, just, and good*; holy in its precepts and prohibitions, just in its sanction, and good in its use and tendency.

Rom. vii. 12.

III *Prop.* MAN by Sin injur'd the relative or reputative glory of governing Justice, and cast contempt on God's Government, and thereby became subject to the Curse, forfeited all right to the Reward, yea, became utterly incapable of recovering that right by the Covenant of Works. For *Judgment came upon all men to condemnation*; and, *All have sinned, and come short of the glory*

Rom. v. 18. iii. 23.

of

of God: Yea, *Death paſſed upon all men, for* SERM.
that all have ſinned. Rom. v. 12. I.

IV *Prop.* THAT the Glory of governing Juſtice might not ſuffer by the ſaving of Sinners, there muſt be a Satisfaction for the offence they committed, and a meritorious Price for the good to be diſpenſed to them. God's Government muſt not be arraigned before Angels or Men, as weak: Nor would the Juſtice of God ſeem an approver of rebellion, by admitting Sin to paſs unpuniſhed; nor admit ſuch an occaſion of diſobedience to his Government. By *Satisfaction*, I mean, that which fully vindicates the reputative glory of Juſtice ſo injured by Sin, and ſecures the ends of Government. By *Merit*, I intend, that which governing Juſtice adjudged proportionable to the benefit to be conferred on the Sinners.

V *Prop.* SINNERS being utterly incapable for this, God, our Lawgiver, did ordain and admit Chriſt, with his conſent, to be the Redeemer and Saviour of loſt Sinners, by making Satisfaction for Sin, and Meriting the forfeited Bleſſings, and much greater for them. Hence it is ſaid, he was *appointed.* This was an act of the Lawgiver, as above the Law; but it was not, by the Law of Works: Yea, God diſpenſed with the Law of Works, in admitting Chriſt's Sufferings and Obedience to be ſatisfactory Heb. iii. 2.

and

SERM. I. and meritorious for offenders. That Law knew no *vicarious* obedience or puniſhment: *The Soul that ſins, muſt die*, and not another for it, was the language of the Law. Divine Grace and Sovereignty here exert themſelves, to anſwer the ends of the Law, by ſubſtituting a Saviour of loſt Souls.

VI *Prop.* IT was in the Covenant of Redemption, wherein it was adjuſted and agreed, what ſhould be thus Satisfactory and Meritorious, and ſo effectual to ſave Sinners. See *Iſa.* liii. 10, 11, 12. *Pſa.* xl. 6, 7, 8. *Zech.* vi. 13. *Joh.* xvii. 4. The Parties in this Covenant, are the Father and Spirit on the one part; and the Son on the other. Whatever Chriſt ſuffered in time, and all the Obedience he yielded, were terms propoſed to him, and accepted by him. In that *Volume* were recorded, what his Work and Rewards were to be; and of the latter, the Salvation of his members is a part. What he herein ſubmitted to, he became obliged as an act of faithfulneſs to perform. Whatever was herein promiſed him, he had a right to receive, and did accordingly claim. By this compact, he agreed to be a Subject and Servant; and hence the Law of Mediation did commence as binding. By this compact his Obedience and Sufferings became a Satisfaction, that otherwiſe had been ineffectual.

Satis-

Satisfaction imports a refuſeableneſs, antecedently to an agreement: And hence we may perceive, that though what Chriſt paid was a full equivalent, yet it was not in all things the ſame in kind, as man was obliged to. True, Juſtice took care, that all was inſerted into this Covenant, as Chriſt's Work, which was neceſſary to the reparation of its Glory: And hence the great Eſſentials of the Law of Works were inſerted, as Articles to be performed by Chriſt, *viz.* ſinleſs *Obedience* as a man, which is the ſum of the Precept, and *Death* the ſubſtance of the Threatning; and theſe to be done and ſuffered in the Human Nature. Nevertheleſs ſome things in the Threatnings were incompetent to him; as ſpiritual Death, the hatred of God, *&c.* And many Precepts were not agreeable to his circumſtances, all which were omitted: Nay, many things, which the Law of Works never enjoin'd on men, were neceſſary to be done by the Redeemer, and therefore were ſuperadded. From this Covenant ariſeth the immediate obligation of Chriſt to all his Obedience, as well as the rule and meaſure of it; and from this his Title to all the Reward, much of which the *premiant* Sanction of the Law of Works never contained, and could never give a right to. SERM. I.

No doubt, that in this Covenant were adjuſted the terms of the application of Redemption to men, which the Goſpel-Covenant

SERM. I. nant doth enjoin; which, I ſuppoſe, the *Aſſembly* mean, when they join the Covenant of Redemption, and the Goſpel-Co-
Larg. Cat. Qu. 21. venant together; and ſay, "it was made "with Chriſt, as the ſecond *Adam:*" But they cannot intend, that Chriſt obliged himſelf to perform perſonally all the Terms of the application of his purchaſed benefits to us, as he did the Terms of the impetration of thoſe benefits. He bound not himſelf to repent and believe for us, tho' he did to die for us; yea, and as Surety of the Goſpel-Covenant he engaged, that the Elect ſhould repent, believe, and perſevere: But yet the benefits ſhould be applied to men upon their perſonal believing; and they are required by the Goſpel ſo to believe, and become themſelves federating Parties in the Goſpel-Covenant. This runs throughout the *Aſſembly's Confeſſion* and *Ca-*
Catech. Qu. 32. *techiſms.* As when they ſay, in the *larger Catechiſm*, "Faith is required by the Cove-"nant, as a Condition to intereſt us in
Qu. 153. "Chriſt:" And again, "That we may "eſcape the wrath and curſe of God, due "to us by reaſon of the tranſgreſſion of "the Law, God requireth of us Repent-"ance towards God, and Faith towards "our Lord Jeſus, and the diligent uſe of "the outward means, whereby Chriſt "communicates to us the benefits of his "Mediation." You have the ſame in the *leſſer Catechiſm:* And they oft tell us, of Promiſes

Promises made to Graces, &c. by which, and much more, it is plain, that *Conditions* are required of men. SERM. I.

VII *Prop.* SATISFACTION being to be made for innumerable Sins committed, and not only forfeited Blessings, but even greater, being to be merited, and that for many; the Obedience of Christ must exceed what the Law of Works enjoined on mankind, as the condition of its reward.

WHAT was necessary from every single man for himself, could not by legal Justice be sufficient from one man for all others that omitted it: Now the Law required obedience to its precepts from every single man. That could not merit the reward for Sinners, which was but necessary to an Innocent man's title to the reward: But what the Law required was necessary to Innocent man's obtaining the reward, though he had not sinned before. That which was by governing Justice adjudged but proportionable to a less reward, could not merit a greater reward: But whatever the Law of Works required, was but proportioned to its lesser rewards. *Lesser* I call them; for though I allow them to be an eternal Felicity in another world, yet these were not Union with Christ, nor such a degree of Conformity to his Glory, &c. much less did they include the rewards promised

SERM. I. miſed to Chriſt for his Obedience, as *a Name above every Name, all Judgment and Authority*, with many more, all which are the reward of Chriſt's Obedience. As to Expiation of Sin by puniſhment for Reconciliation with the offended God, the Law enjoins no ſuch Duty, nor hinted ſuch a thing. Its Threatning was eternal Death, as eternal: Eternity was an ingredient into the miſery of every Sinner, and can be removed by nothing but the Lawgiver's diſpenſing therewith, upon Conſiderations equally vindicating the glory of Juſtice, as this Eternity of Sinners torments would do: And it muſt be equivalent, not only to the eternal woe of one Offender, but at leaſt of all thoſe Sinners who eſcape it.

CONSIDER theſe and the like things, and ſee, if the Law of Works (which all men were perfectly to obey,) did enjoin all that Obedience, which Chriſt was to yield as the condition of his reward, of which man's Salvation is but part; eſpecially when it is a reward adjuſted by ſtrict governing Juſtice, abating nothing of the meriting Price thereof. I mention theſe things, to let you ſee the danger of confining Chriſt's Obedience, to the *idem* of what the Law enjoined on man, or promiſed to him. Alas, we ſhould be infinite Loſers thereby; we could at beſt expect no more Happineſs, than what the Law of Works promiſed. Nay, I think, a Redemption of Sinners

in

in a way of Justice, would be more exceptionable than some Persons think, who dare much, because they see too little. A Suretiship of Christ, confined to what the Covenant of Works includes, would be an uncomfortable Doctrine. SERM. I.

But the Obedience of Christ was not only super-equivalent to all that man was to do by the Law, but equal to all the reward promised in the Covenant of Redemption. The Dignity of his Person, the things he did and suffered, and the Intensness of his Obedience; his Unobligedness to do or suffer these, but on the account of glorifying God by satisfying for Sin, and opening a way for exerting Grace to Sinners; with many more, concur to aggrandize his Obedience: Of this more elsewhere.

And if it be *objected*, Will not the Dignity of his Person let in all happiness to us by a Suretiship, in the mere Covenant of Works?

I answer, No: But yet I ask, Where doth the Law of Works require this Dignity in the person obeying? Or, How can it put such a value on what it requir'd not, and how can it impute that Dignity to us which it never exacted? And if it could, Where are many of those forementioned rewards promised in its Sanction? And if they be not so included, How can that Covenant convey a right to them?

God

SERM. I. God hath better contrived for his own Glory, and for our Good, for which we ſhould for ever praiſe and adore him. He hath taken the eſſentials of the Law into the Covenant of Redemption, and added theſe to other ſuperadded articles; promiſing Chriſt *a ſeed*, and their utmoſt felicity, as alſo rewards to himſelf in the human nature, if he performed theſe articles. Theſe Chriſt undertook, and performed to a tittle. And what Chriſt hereby acquired, he is diſpenſing in a Goſpel-way of Grace, and yet of Government: And bleſſed be his name, he is *our Surety*, that we ſhall not violate the Terms of the Goſpel-Covenant; and *a Witneſs for God*, that we ſhall obtain the good promiſed in the ſaid Covenant.

VIII *Prop.* OUR Redeemer did fully vindicate the glory of governing Juſtice from the injury offered by Sin, and cauſed his Government by his Obedience to appear venerable, notwithſtanding all the forgiveneſs and bleſſings which Grace ſhould beſtow in Chriſt's right upon any Sinners.

FORGIVENESS is a mercy, which the Devil foreſaw not; and beſides, according to God's methods with himſelf, he could hardly ſuſpect it poſſible, becauſe he knew God would not reflect on his own Juſtice or Purity, nor proſtitute his glory as a Governor, nor hazard the ends of Government,

ment, by pardoning Delinquents: He there- SERM. fore tempted man with confidence of his I. final Ruin, if perſuaded to tranſgreſs. A Satisfaction by an equivalent, he underſtood not: But infinite Wiſdom triumphed over Satan's wiles, and ſpoiled his glorying over his captive prey. God finds a way of Forgiveneſs, without tempting any to offend the more; and appears exactly juſt, whilſt yet he ſhews as much pardoning Mercy as the offenders needed; yea, makes Sin appear more awful, and his Government more ſacred, by the Satisfaction on which he pardoned, than in the Puniſhment of all that had tranſgreſſed. Hence he is ſaid, *to declare at this time his Righteouſneſs, that he might be juſt, and the juſtifier of him which believeth in Jeſus.* Rom. iii. 26. The Apoſtle had before affirmed, That the pardon of Sins committed *before Chriſt's coming* was on the account of *Chriſt's Propitiation*, as well as of thoſe ſince: And upon this he adds, That in the Propitiation whereby any Sins were remitted, God appeared *righteous* whilſt he pardoned; though he juſtifies the Believer, yet he appears glorioufly *juſt* in that Propitiation whereupon he juſtifies.

IX *Prop.* THE Lord Jeſus thus glorified God as he ſatisfied and merited, by perfectly obeying the Will of God, and by the whole of his Humiliation, eſpecially in offering up himſelf an atoning

SERM. I. Sacrifice by death upon the Croſs. His *active* and *paſſive* Obedience concurred in the whole of Redemption.

1. HE perfectly obeyed the Will of God. Whatever was adjuſted as his Duty, he performed: He made the authority of the Lawgiver manifeſt, and exemplified the perfect purity of the Law. He was habitually *holy*, without defect and blemiſh; and actively obedient, to the extent and ſpirituality of the Precept. *He was holy, harmleſs, undefiled, ſeparate from Sinners:* He fulfilled *all Righteouſneſs*; not refuſing Obedience to the Inſtitution miniſtred by *John the Baptiſt*. He fulfilled the moral Law; yea, he obſerved the ceremonial Law, and filled up every Relation wherein he ſtood. He not only did, what we are to do; but whatever act of Obedience was conſiſtent with his circumſtances: He pleaded no exemption becauſe of his Dignity; nor waved any thing as too mean or difficult. An accurate obſervance of the Divine Will ran, as a conſtant Line, through his whole Life, according to the various opportunities preſented to him: And every act of his Obedience was filled with that love, zeal, and alacrity, as might preſcribe inſtruction to the higheſt Angels; and convince them, how juſt, meet, good, and excellent a thing the profoundeſt Obedience is, when *God in fleſh* was thus obſervant. Thus he *made the Law honourable*, and thereby the Lawgiver.

Heb. vii. 26.

Mat. iii. 15.

Iſa. xlii. 21.

2. HE

2. He was humbled, and ſuffered the utmoſt puniſhment, which Juſtice required, and God propoſed, for the expiation of Sin. He was Incarnate, and therein *emptied himſelf*. He was *a man of ſorrows*, as if they made up his conſtitution; and was *acquainted with grief*, even with the inwards of it, as his familiar. He *endured reproach*, ſo as to cry out, it *hath broken my Heart*. So low was he brought, as to expreſs his ſtate by thoſe words, *I am a worm, and no man*. He was beholden to others for *neceſſaries*; which he ſeems to have felt, in the commonneſs of that paſſage with him, *It is more bleſſed to give, than to receive*. He received comfort by the *miniſtry of Angels*. How oft was he blaſphemed, and mock'd by men, griev'd by his followers, and deſerted by his friends? His Blood was often ſhed; when circumciſed, when ſcourged and crowned with thorns, when faſten'd to the Croſs with nails, and at laſt when pierced with the ſpear and his *heart-blood* let out. And, Oh! the direful *Agony*, which ſo amazed him, forced clots of Blood, and rendered him *ſorrowful even unto death*. God hid his face from him; and a *death*, in the manner of it *accurſed*, as well as *ſhameful*, he taſted and endured. He lay in the Grave for a time, after he had thus waded thro' a Sea of blood, ſhame, and terror. Alas! Who can tell what he underwent, whoſe

SERM. I.

Phil. ii. 7.
Iſa. liii. 3.
Pſal. lxix. 20.
Pſa. xxii. 6
Luke viii. 3.
Acts xx. 35.
Mat. iv. 11
Luke xxii. 43.
John xix. 34.

SERM. I. Reſentments of all muſt give them a weight beyond our conjecture? One ſo glorious, to be thus debaſed! one ſo near to God, to be thus deſerted! *&c.*

How aſtoniſhing a ſight was it, to ſee Chriſt hang upon a Croſs? The purpoſes deſigned by it, muſt be anſwerable to the wonder: And ſo we ſhall acknowledge, when we underſtand the juſtice and purity of God, the evil of Sin, the harmony of the Divine Government, the value of Pardon and eternal Life, the honour of the Mediator, and the influence of his Obedience on myriads of Angels.

AT preſent, we ſee the Pardon of Sin made conſiſtent with Juſtice. Our Lord endured the Puniſhment of Sin, that God might be glorious, whilſt the believing Sinner eſcapes. By this, God declared *the Righteouſneſs* of his Government, whilſt he glorified his Grace in ſaving tranſgreſſors. Chriſt's being *obedient even unto Death*, honour'd the Law above all that men could perform in their condition; yea, ſets it above contempt, when the Penitent is forgiven his greateſt enormities: So that God as our Governor, receives ſuch Glory by Chriſt's Subjection, as that it ſuffers nothing by the impunity and happineſs of all who are ſaved. Yea, a dying Chriſt is more fit to awe every one againſt Rebellion, and to diſpoſe to the exacteſt Obedience, than any other conſideration.

FOR

FOR the further clearing of this Point, I ſhall propoſe three Enquiries. SERM. I.

1 Enq. *Were Chriſt's Sufferings a part of the Obedience of Chriſt, whereby we are made righteous?*

Anſ. THE Sufferings of Chriſt were *a part* of the *Obedience* of Chriſt, whereby we are *made righteous.* No Precept could try his Obedience more, than that he ſhould *make his Soul an Offering for Sin.* Herein he out-did the Loyalty of all Beings. For the proof of this point, I ſhall give you ſome further Evidence, that Chriſt's Sufferings were a part of his Obedience.

1. WHATEVER was endured by Chriſt was enjoined him in a way of Authority, upon ſuppoſition he would be Redeemer. He agreed to be a Subject and *Servant:* And he *learned what Obedience was,* even by what he *endured*; and ſtill acknowledged an Authority over him as Mediator. *This Commandment,* ſays he, *I have received of my Father:* And, *Not as I will, but as thou wilt,* were his words, when the human nature hinted ſo much reluctancy, as expreſſed the Cup to be truly bitter. Heb. v. 8. John x. 18. Mat. xxvi. 39.

2. CHRIST's Sufferings were endured by him in a way of Obedience: He *obeyed,* in whatever he endured. *The Lord God hath opened mine Ear, and I was not rebellious; I gave my Back to the Smiters,* &c. Iſa. l. 5, 6;

SERM. I. And when the hour of his Sufferings was come, he ſhews the moſt obediental regard, and ſays, *Thy will be done*: So that
Phil. ii. 8. he was *obedient unto Death*. The Law of Mediation enjoined it, and his Will exerted its true conſent, even *giving up the ghoſt*.

3. THE efficacy of Chriſt's Sufferings much depended on their being acts of Obedience. For had they been againſt his Will, or had he repented after he had firſt agreed, men had failed of Salvation. *Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he ſaith,*
Heb. x. 9, 10. *Lo, I come to do thy Will, O God: By the which Will we are ſanctified, through the offering of the body of Jeſus Chriſt once for all.* The Will of God appointing and accepting this atonement, and the Will of Chriſt obeying and freely performing what was appointed, are what we are ſaved by. The obedient heart of Chriſt in all, gives a power thereto. Hence there's a Streſs laid on his *voluntarineſs* in his Work; and we
Gal. i. 4. Heb. vii. 27. are told, *He gave himſelf*; and *offered up himſelf*. He teſtified this, in being the *Prieſt* that offered himſelf, as well as the *Sacrifice* that was offered.

THESE being ſuch amazing inſtances of Obedience, tended much to glorify God's Government. How ſacred is that authority, and how binding are its mandates, when the Son of God in Fleſh will obſerve them, even when they require ſuch Sufferings to be endured and ſubmitted to?

Theſe

These are harder precepts, than Angels or Men were ever called to obey; and therefore how chearful should they be in observing such Commands, as be less humbling and difficult; especially when the authority of God's precepts are founded in his absolute Dominion over them? But Christ could be under no Law, till by his own consent he was willing to be a Subject. I infer then, that if Christ's *Sufferings* were *a part of his Obedience*, then we are *made righteous* thereby; or we are *made righteous* by only some part of his Obedience; which I suppose you'll not affirm. Again, SERM. I.

4. CHRIST's Sufferings are a part of his *meriting Righteousness*: And this will both prove, that they are *part of Christ's Obedience*, and that we are *made righteous* thereby; unless any should surmise, we are *made righteous* by somewhat of Christ's, besides *his Obedience*; or, that his *meriting Righteousness* doth not conduce to make us righteous. Now that Christ's Sufferings are a part of his Righteousness, might be demonstrated many ways; as, (1.) They were part of the *condition*, whereupon Christ had *a right* to men's Pardon and Salvation. (2.) Christ pleads and *intercedes* in the virtue of his Sufferings. (3.) We are expressly said to be *justified by his Blood*. (4.) They are *meritorious* of what Isa. liii. 11, 12. 1 Joh. ii. 1, 2. Rom. v. 9.

SERM. I. bleſſings we receive. But theſe things will be inſiſted on in the third Enquiry.

2 Enq. *Was Chriſt's Incarnation a part of his Humiliation?*

Anſ. CHRIST's Incarnation was *a part* of his Humiliation. To argue this point with evidence, I muſt mind you, that the ſubject of this propoſition muſt be taken as it naturally lieth. I would think it of no uſe to you, and in itſelf a vain queſtion to aſk, Had Chriſt aſſumed our nature in another State than it is ſince the Fall, or had Chriſt become incarnate in another manner, than by being conceived in the womb of the Virgin; whether then his Incarnation had been a part of his Humiliation? Though I know, ſome *Popiſh Schoolmen* ungroundedly affirm, that Chriſt would have taken our nature into union with him, if *Adam* had not fallen, (and ſo there would not have been that place for his Humiliation,) yet I think it not hard to prove, that for the Eternal Word to become Incarnate in any manner, would have been a great Humiliation; and there muſt have been ſomewhat that would have rendered it ſo, or he would not have aſſumed our nature. But we have nothing to do with ſuch Chimeras. Chriſt was Incarnate; he hath aſſumed our nature; and the Word of God tells us, in what manner he

he assumed it, and to what ends, and in what State. Therefore we must in our Question speak of Christ's Incarnation as it was, and not as it was not; and which ever way it be decided, every one must confine his conceptions according as the Subject in the Question is stated, unless they will deceive others and themselves. SERM. I.

I SHALL offer these Reasons to prove, that Christ's *Incarnation* was *a part* of his *Humiliation.*

1 *R.* THE Word of God in express terms affirms this, *Phil.* ii. 7. *But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made in the likeness of men.* Let us for the better apprehending the force of this Text, consider, [1.] The Context. [2.] The words in the Verse. [3.] The Objection that may be offered to enervate it, from *ver.* 8. For if the Context tend to prove, that Christ's Incarnation was a part of his Humiliation, and the Text in plain words affirm it, and there be nothing in the whole against it, the Proof must be express; only let me give you the 7th *verse* as it is in the Original, which by our translation is darkened. Christ *emptied himself, taking on him the form of a Servant, being made in the likeness of men.*

[1.] LET us consider the *Context.* The Apostle had commanded self-denial, charity, and humility; *ver.* 3, 4. This charge he inforceth

SERM. I. inforceth by Chriſt's example, *ver.* 5. *Let this mind be in you, which was in Chriſt Jeſus:* And that he might give this inſtance the greater advantage, (1.) He ſhews the glorious dignity of Chriſt as God, *ver.* 6. *Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.* He was equally glorious; he that aſſumed our nature, and ſuffered in it, was as excellent, and the beams of his Glory as illuſtrious, as God himſelf; being of one eſſence and nature with God, and having no other nature beſides his Divine. And (2.) He then proceeds to tell them, how this glorious One *humbled* and debaſed himſelf, *ver.* 7. of which preſently; and therefore lets them ſee, how meet it was, that they ſhould not grudge at *denying themſelves*, or being moſt lowly and *humble*, when Chriſt, ſo infinitely more glorious, was content to become ſo low and mean, as to *take our Nature*, and ſuffer in it. You ſee the Context requires, that whatever is affirmed in this *ſeventh verſe* muſt refer to *Chriſt's Debaſement*, or it cannot anſwer the plain ſcope of the Apoſtle's reaſoning; which is, to perſuade men to be *ſelf-denying*, from this example of Chriſt's *humbling himſelf*.

[2.] THE words of the *ſeventh verſe* are next to be conſidered, *He made himſelf of no reputation*, ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε. This is the firſt Expreſſion; and if you regard the derivation of the word, it amounts to this: He ren-

rendered himſelf ſuch, as if his perfections and glory were vain or uſeleſs. The word is conſonantly tranſlated, 1 *Cor.* ix. 15. *Make* [*my glorying*] *void.* It's rendered by *Tertullian*, *Se exhauſit*, *&c.* And *Beza* thus explains it, *Quaſi ex omni ſeipſum ad nihil redegit:* Of all, he made himſelf nothing. *Zanchius* raiſeth it higher, *Se evacuavit omni gloria, & æqualitate cum patre:* He emptied himſelf of all glory, and equality with the Father. Indeed who can comprehend the utmoſt of this *Exinanition?* Now theſe words muſt refer to his *Incarnation*, as what let in, and made him capable of, all the ſubſequent Sufferings. The next words are, *And took upon him the form of a ſervant*; or, *taking on him the form of a ſervant*; λαβων. Wherein was this? I anſwer, In taking our nature. For by aſſuming this nature, he became *God's Servant*, and ſubject to his authority, as if not his own maſter; tho' a Servant to man he never was. He that was *in the form of God*, that is truly ſo, was *in the form of a Servant*, that is truly ſo. This is the ſenſe which the next words confirm; *And was made* (or *being made*) *in the likeneſs of men.* Not likeneſs, in oppoſition to the reality of the human nature; but a conformity in nature, and the natural operations thereof: He aſſumed *our very human nature.* I hope then, the plain order and import of the words appear to be this; The Lord

SERM. I.

Jeſus

SERM. I. *Jeſus* did greatly *empty* and humble himſelf *in taking our nature*, by the very aſſumption of which nature he was *a Servant*. And leſt you ſhould think, that by being *a Servant* is meant, ſome ſervile debaſement after he aſſumed this nature, and not his mere Incarnation, the Apoſtle explains it yet more: *Being made in the likeneſs of men*, is added after *the form of a Servant*. Nay, leſt any one ſhould deny his Incarnation to be part of his Humiliation, by inverting the order of the words; he proceeds, *ver.* 8. *And being found in faſhion* (or *in habit*) *as a man, he humbled himſelf*: As if he had ſaid, Being thus emptied and debaſed in taking our nature, and being to obſervance in a State common with other mere men, he went on to undergo thoſe ſenſible Sufferings, which his human nature rendered him capable of enduring. Which leads me,

[3.] To the *Objection* from *ver.* 8. *Being found in faſhion as a man, he humbled himſelf, becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the croſs.* From whence may be objected, That his Humiliation is confined to his *dying* in the human nature, after he had aſſumed it. To which I *anſwer*, That Chriſt's *dying* was indeed *a great part* of his Humiliation, but that doth not argue that it was *all* his Humiliation. Chriſt's death, and lying in the grave, finiſhed his Humiliation; but it doth not follow, that

was

was the *beginning* of it. His Incarnation did begin it, tho' he proceeded to consummate it by *obeying unto death.* And ἐκένωσε, or *emptying himself*, which is aſcribed to his Incarnation, doth as truly expreſs an Humiliation, as ἐταπείνωσεν, which we render *humbled*: Yea, the former denotes a far greater Humiliation, as to the ſignificancy of the word. To conclude this; I cannot conceive, how the Apoſtle could more expreſsly aſſert, that Chriſt's *Incarnation* was *a part* of his Humiliation; Nay, he ſeems to lay a very great ſtreſs upon it; and variouſly expreſſeth Chriſt's aſſuming our nature, as that wherein the wonder conſiſted moſt. Oh that he, who had a glory ſhining equally with the Father, ſhould ſo ſubmit to the with-holding of it, as to be made a man! Let me mind you, that the *Socinians* will thank any man, that denies the ſenſe I give of this Text.

SERM. I

2 *R.* CHRIST did in his very Incarnation, in obedience to God's command, voluntarily ſubmit to the concealing and ſuſpending of his manifeſtative Glory, that he might be capable to ſuffer the utmoſt Puniſhments he had engaged to endure.

THIS argument will appear in greater ſtrength, if we conſider it in its ſeveral parts; [1.] By ſhewing what a concealing and ſuſpending of Chriſt's manifeſtative Glory there was in his very Incarnation. [2.] That his ſubmitting and enduring this,

in

SERM. I. in obedience to God, and for the ends he thus assumed our nature, was truly a degree of Humiliation. After which, [3.] I shall answer an Objection that may be offered against the Son of God being capable of being humbled.

[1.] THERE was a great suspending and concealing of Christ's manifestative Glory in his Incarnation. Our nature was taken as an obscuring veil, and in the manner of assuming it, that veil was exceeding thick; which will appear in these things.

(1.) CHRIST was conceived in a woman's womb, and there was he confined the usual time: He was born, and spent part of his time in the unactive state of infancy and childhood: He was capable of *growing in knowledge*. This points to the manner of his Incarnation: And is there no concealment of his Glory herein, no laying it aside? Oh, for *God-Man* to be at any time unactive as an *Embrio*, or child in the womb! for him to be *born of a woman*, for him to pass through the incapacities of infancy, and the like necessary consequences of the manner of his Incarnation! Sure here's a Suspension of Glory. *Eve* was formed in a way more glorious: Whereas the Apostle notes it of Christ, that *he was made of a woman, made under the law.*

Luk. ii. 52.

Gal. iv. 4.

(2.) CHRIST in his very Incarnation assumed the human nature when in a low state, yea after the Fall, and subject to many

many effects of that Fall. It was not a glorious body, a ſpiritual body, a body cloathed with immortality; but a body ſubject to hunger, thirſt, wearineſs, yea death itſelf. The Apoſtle leaves a remark on this: *Tho' we have known Chriſt after the fleſh, yet now henceforth know we him ſo no more.* Further, what a veil was it, that he aſſumed our nature after man had ſinned, after he was condemned, and part of the Sentence executed? Yea, there was need of an extraordinary way of Generation, to prevent the propagation of guilt, and defilement to him. Our Lord was ſubject to grief, fear, trouble, temptations from without, *&c.* and to the ſame *infirmities* as we fallen men are, *Sin only excepted.* And was all this no Humiliation? His mere Incarnation was his aſſuming a body, in the frame and habit whereof theſe *infirmities* had actual place; and not a body exempted from theſe! He was *in the likeneſs of ſinful fleſh.* SERM. I. 2 Cor. v. 16. Heb. iv. 15. Rom. viii. 3.

(3.) THE Apoſtle includes in Chriſt's Incarnation his Inferiority below Angels: *We ſee Jeſus, who was made a little lower than the Angels, for the ſuffering of death, &c.* Though his *Exinanition* in aſſuming our nature be not all, yet it is a great part of his *Minoration*, as taking a nature below the Angelical; though he could ſoon raiſe it above Angels, when he had aſſumed it, and finiſhed his work therein; and hence Heb. ii. 9.

ſome

SERM. I. ſome render βραχυ τι, *for a little while.* But it is plain, that the human nature in itſelf is *below* the Angelical; and therefore in taking *this lower nature*, he was ſo far *humbled*, and went ſo far further from his Glory. And then,

[2.] CHRIST's receding from his Glory, in taking our nature in this ſtate, and after this manner, in obedience to God, and for the ends for which he aſſumed ſuch a body, was truly a degree of Humiliation. That Heb. x. 5. Chriſt ſhould *become man*, was one article *ſubmitted to* by him: It was *a Debt*, he Heb. ii. 16, 17. paid; ωφειλε, it *behoved him* to be *made like unto his brethren.* He was Incarnate, and that in the very deſcribed manner, that he might *be capable* of enduring thoſe full effects of Sin; that he might *taſte Death for every man*, and might *be tempted*, and the like. Had not he aſſumed our fleſh, he was not capable of enduring theſe: Yea, had he not aſſumed our nature in a humbled ſtate, and ſubmitted to a veil on his Glory, the world would have been dazled with his brightneſs above the Sun's, and none have dared to blaſpheme or aſſault him. But our Lord was thus Incarnate; his human nature was in this humbled condition, and not in an exalted ſtate, when he aſſumed it, and begun not to be humbled afterwards: He laid by his Glory, when he put on our fleſh in his conception; and Joh. xvii. 5. therefore he prays, *Glorify me with the glory*

glory which I had with thee before the world was. And the Apoſtle reckons it as a degree of his Humiliation, that he was *made of a woman, made under the law.* Yea, I think it might be demonſtrated, that the Lord's quitting the Diſplay of his Divine Glory in his conception, birth, and the whole time of his life, was the greateſt degree of his Humiliation. And what can exclude his *Incarnation*, eſpecially in ſuch a manner, from being *a part* of his *Humiliation*, unleſs this following Objection? for it was, in a way of obedience, an obſcuring of his Glory, and this to abaſing purpoſes. This leads me therefore,

SERM. I.

Gal. iv. 4.

[3.] To conſider the *Objection* that may here be offered, *How could the Divine Nature be humbled?* To which it is enough to *anſwer*, That it was the Eternal Word, or the Second Perſon that was *humbled*, as far as his Incarnation obſcured his Glory, in the way above deſcribed. For, (1.) The Divine Nature eſſentially conſidered, could neither be humbled, nor exalted; nothing can add to, or take from it. (2.) Neither could the Divine Nature feel or reſent Sufferings, in the ſame manner as the human nature; it was not capable of Paſſion. Yet, (3.) The Eternal Word was capable of laying aſide his manifeſtative Glory, and of ſubjecting himſelf to do ſo, in obedience to the Father, and purſuant to his Covenant-undertaking, and to make himſelf

SERM. I. capable of drinking the whole of the Cup, by being clothed with ſuch fleſh, and that in a manner ſo obſcuring of his Glory. It's more ſtrange, that this ſhould be queſtioned by ſuch, who aſcribe to Chriſt acts properly mediatorial before his Incarnation.

3 *R.* CHRIST for his very Incarnation, among other things, received authority as
Joh. v. 27. a Reward: For *the Father hath given him authority to execute judgment, becauſe he is the Son of man.* If you ſay, He was not capable of ſuch a gift but as *the Son of man*, even that argues a degree of Humiliation; that the Perſon to whom all was due by virtue of his Divine Eſſence, ſhould aſſume another nature to be capable of this as a gift. But the words expreſs his being *the Son of man* to have a cauſality, ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστί. Authority is a reward for his Incarnation, among other things: And if this be rewarded, it muſt come within the compaſs of his Humiliation; for all Chriſt's meritorious acts come under the conſideration of his *being humbled*, and the Acts of his exalted State are not properly meritorious.

I MIGHT add other *Reaſons*; as, from the dependent ſtate to which Chriſt became ſubject, by aſſuming our nature; and from the way how the Glory of Chriſt's Perſon added to the value of the Sufferings of the human nature, *&c.* But I think what is already offered is ſufficient.

YET

YET if it be *objected*, That *if Christ's Incarnation was a part of his Humiliation, then he is in a state of Humiliation in Heaven.* I answer, SERM. I.

(1.) THAT Christ's continuing in the Nature he assumed when he hath exalted it, may not be a part of his Humiliation, and yet his assuming that nature was a part of his Humiliation. The act of assumption is one thing, and remaining united is another: The nature in a humble state, as it was when he was Incarnate, is one thing; and that nature in a perfected glorious state, as it is now in Heaven, is another. Christ doth not in Heaven assume our nature *de novo*; but remains united to that nature which he assumed in the womb: And the state of this nature is now *glorious*, whereas he took our flesh when it was *inglorious*. A Prince may humble himself in marrying an ignoble, deformed, sickly Beggar; and yet it will not follow, he humbleth himself still, because he lives with her as a Wife, especially if he hath ennobled, beautified, healed, and enriched her.

(2.) Saying, that Christ's human nature is *exalted* in Heaven, is an acknowledgment that Christ was *humbled* in taking our nature in the manner and condition he assumed it in. Would Christ's body be in an exalted State, if it were in the form it had in its first conception? Yet so it was, in the moment of his Incarnation. Were it

SERM. I. exalted, if still to be born? Yet so it was, when Christ assumed it. Would he be in an exalted state, if still an Infant or Child? Yet this was necessary from the manner of Christ's Incarnation. Would this nature be exalted, if still subject to weariness, pain, grief, hunger, shame, temptation, and death? Yet such was the frame and habit of it, when he assumed it. This vast difference in the state of Christ's body in Heaven, and when he became Incarnate, may convince us, that Christ *humbled himself* in assuming it; unless you will suppose, it was *first a glorious body*, that is, when he took it; and after he assumed it, it was deprived of that Glory and humbled, and then again exalted: But such conceits I pass by.

(3.) I MIGHT add, Though the exalted body of Christ be now a more fitted *medium*, whereby the Divine Glory is exerted and manifest, and also the glorious purposes, attained by the Hypostatical Union continued, do compensate it; nevertheless the *human nature* is in a sense at present *some veil* upon the glory of Christ, as the Eternal Word, notwithstanding the exaltation of the human nature. See 1 *Cor.* xv. 28. But these things are so beyond our comprehension, that an humble Reverence doth best set limits to our thoughts. But what hath been insisted on, without enlarging on this, may suffice to give us juster

thoughts

thoughts of ourſelves as men; at leaſt ſo as not to ſurmiſe, it was no act of Humiliation in the Lord of Glory to *become man*, by being conceived and born; for him to be *a Child*, to aſſume Fleſh ſubject to wearineſs, pain, ſorrow, faintneſs, temptation, death, *&c.* for the Creator of the world to aſſume into a perſonal union with himſelf, the loweſt ſort of intelligent Creatures; and for the Lord of Glory to become a Subject and Servant. SERM. I.

I SHALL conclude this Point, by giving you the *Weſtminſter Aſſembly*'s judgment in their *leſſer Catechiſm*: "Q. 27. *Wherein did Chriſt's Humiliation conſiſt?* *A.* Chriſt's "Humiliation conſiſted in his being born, "and that in a low condition, made under "the Law, *&c.*" You ſee, that they thought Chriſt's *being born* was a part of his Humiliation; and not only the *miſeries* that followed his being born, nor the *low condition* wherein he was born. And in their *larger Catechiſm*, Q. 46. "The eſtate of "Chriſt's Humiliation was, that low con"dition, wherein he, for our ſakes, empty"ing himſelf of his Glory, took upon him "the form of a Servant, *in his low conception, and birth*, life, death, and after his "death till his reſurrection." And Q. 47, "Chriſt *humbled himſelf in his conception*, "in that being from all eternity the Son of "God, in the boſom of the Father, he "was pleaſed, in the fulneſs of time, to Aſſembly's *Catechiſm.*

SERM. I. "*become the Son of Man*, made of a woman of low estate, and to be born of her, "with divers circumstances of more than "ordinary abasement." You see, his very becoming the Son of Man, and his Conception whereby he was Incarnate, were parts of Christ's Humiliation. But further, it may be enquired,

3 Enq. *Did Christ by his Death and Sufferings merit any thing, and that for us?*

Ans. CHRIST by his Death and Sufferings *merited*, yea even saving blessings *for us*. And here, [1.] I shall premise somewhat that may tend to clear this. And then, [2.] I shall prove the thing I affirm.

[1.] LET this be premised, That on the one hand, Christ's death and sufferings may be conceived of, first as satisfactory, and then meritorious; while on the other hand, Christ's active obedience is to be conceived, as first, fit to be meritorious, and then satisfactory. The reason of the former is this; Had not Christ's death and sufferings been for to make satisfaction, God had not admitted them, or delighted therein, as the merit of any benefit; nay, God would have looked at them with dislike, instead of accounting them a meet Price of blessings. The reason for the latter is; That had not Christ's

Chriſt's active obedience been perfect, and ſo fit to *merit*, it could not ſatisfy, or be a recompence for man's diſobedience, by vindicating the injured Glory of God's righteous government. Imperfect obedience had tempted creatures to offend, inſtead of atoning God for the offence. And now, SERM. I.

[2.] I SHALL prove, that Chriſt's death and ſufferings did *merit* greatly, and that for us. Short hints will ſuffice to confirm a poſition ſo plain.

1. THAT for which Chriſt was rewarded, both as to himſelf, and as to us, did truly *merit*, and that for us: But Chriſt was rewarded, both as to himſelf and us, for his death and ſufferings; *&c.* Now, that Chriſt was rewarded for his death and ſufferings *as to himſelf*, is paſt queſtion. For with reſpect to theſe the Apoſtle ſays, *Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name.* Phil. ii. 9. The Covenant of Redemption adjuſteth this; Chriſt claimeth this oft as of Right, and the Father is oft ſaid to perform it as of Juſtice. And then, that Chriſt was for his death and ſufferings rewarded *as to us*, is as evident. All the ſaving benefits we receive are part of Chriſt's Reward, and are diſpenſed as ſuch: For thus it is declared, *He ſhall ſee of the travail of his ſoul, and ſhall be ſatisfied; by his knowledge ſhall my righteous ſervant juſtify many; for he ſhall bear their iniquities: Therefore will I divide* Iſa. liii. 11, 12.

SERM. I. *him a portion with the great, and he ſhall divide the ſpoil with the ſtrong; becauſe he hath poured out his ſoul unto death, &c.* I ſhall preſently inſtance the ſaving bleſſings, which we receive for the ſufferings of Chriſt, as the procuring cauſe thereof.

2. THAT which is the Price of our Redemption, did *merit* for us: But Chriſt's death and ſufferings were the Price of our Redemption; *&c.* For, as the Apoſtle ſays,

1 Cor. vi. 20. *Ye are bought with a price:* And,

1 Pet. i. 18, 19. *Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, but with the precious blood of Chriſt,* &c. And of *the Church of God,* it is expreſsly ſaid,

Acts 20. 28. that *he hath purchaſed* it *with his own blood.* You cannot doubt, but that by which we are redeemed and bought, did *merit*; the juſt God was a detainer of us as guilty offenders, until Chriſt by his death made reparation to his Glory.

3. THAT which is part of the righteouſneſs of Chriſt for which we are juſtified, did *merit* for us: But Chriſt's death and ſufferings are *part* (at leaſt) of the righteouſneſs of Chriſt for which we are juſtified;

Rom. v. 9. *&c.* For *we are juſtified by his blood.* It's by this blood, as the procuring cauſe; this was the Propitiation: Hence *his blood* is

1 Joh. i. 7. ſaid *to cleanſe us.* I hope you will not doubt, that that of Chriſt, for which we are juſtified, is at leaſt a part of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs.

4. IF

4. If Christ's poverty merited riches for us, then his sufferings *merited* for us: But Christ's poverty merited riches for us; *&c.* *For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich.* He was Owner of all things, but for a time he quitted as it were his claim, to acquire *treasures* for us, who had forfeited all: He had not a cottage of his own to lay his head in, that he might purchase *mansions* for us. SERM. I. 2 Cor. viii. 9.

5. That, in virtue whereof Christ intercedes for, and gives out the saving blessings we receive, did *merit* for us: But it is in the virtue of his death and sufferings that Christ intercedes for, and gives out the saving blessings we receive; *&c.* He is *entred*, as we read, *into the holy place*, or *into Heaven itself.* There he *presents the offering* he had finished on Earth; that is, in the virtue thereof he claims and expects the blessings, promised thereto and merited thereby: The dispensing thereof is committed to him; and each of them is given to us, and received by us, in the express virtue of that offering. I shall enumerate some, and shew that each is assigned to Christ's death and sufferings. Pardon and Sanctification are expressly said to be derived from hence: For *we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins*; Heb. ix. 12, 24. Eph. i. 7

SERM. I.

ſins; which blood *was ſhed for the remiſſion of ſins: Jeſus alſo, that he might ſanctify the people with his own blood, ſuffered without the gate.* Reconciliation too is owing to the ſame cauſe: *You hath he reconciled, in the body of his fleſh through death, to preſent you holy*, &c. Yea, eternal Life, the ſum of all promiſed good, is granted on the ſame account: *That by means of death, for the redemption of the tranſgreſſions that were under the firſt Teſtament, they which are called might receive the promiſe of eternal inheritance.* And can you now ſuppoſe, that we have Remiſſion, Sanctification, Peace, and an eternal Inheritance for Chriſt's death and ſufferings; and that his Interceſſion for theſe and other bleſſings, is in the virtue of his blood; and yet his death merited not theſe?

Mat. xxvi. 28.

Heb. xiii. 12.

Col. i. 21, 22.

Heb. ix. 15.

6. I MIGHT add further, what the Apoſtle ſays, that *by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are ſanctified*: Which muſt not only prove, that Chriſt's death and ſufferings *merited* for us, but that all ſaving bleſſings are under their influence, as the meritorious cauſe thereof.

Heb. x. 14.

IF after all it be *objected*, That *Chriſt's Death and Sufferings were but the paying of a Debt*, and therefore merited nothing. I anſwer,

(1.) WAS not our Obedience *a Debt*? Yea it was ſo, more properly than our Sins

or

or Puniſhment. *Sins* are metaphorically called *Debts*, but they are not things we owe to God, but are the neglect of that obedience which we owe to God, and ſo oblige us to puniſhment. *Puniſhments* too are called *a Debt*, not as what God owes to us as a Debt, or we to him, but as what we are obnoxious to for diſobedience, if God is pleaſed to inflict them: But yet he is not ſo obliged to puniſh us, as to exempt him from a pardoning Right in the way his infinite perfections will adjuſt. If the Objection then will prove, that Chriſt's death merited nothing, becauſe it was the payment of a Debt; then it will more follow, that Chriſt's active obedience merited nothing, for that's as much at leaſt the paying of a Debt, yea more properly. The confuſion which this word *Debt* hath induced weak men into, eſpecially as a *pecuniary Debt*, in the doctrine of Satisfaction, I ſhall afterwards be neceſſitated to ſpeak to. SERM. I.

(2.) CHRIST's death and ſufferings were *acts of Obedience* in Chriſt, and ſo they merited. Our undergoing of *puniſhment* would have been no act of obedience in us, but an involuntary enduring of vengeance: It was not by a divine precept made our Duty, but by the ſanction rendered due to us. There was a threatning whence it muſt be endured, but no commandment that made our *being puniſhed* an obediential act in us.

Is

SERM. I. Is it an act of our obedience, to die a ſpiritual death, or to be hated and abhorred by the Lord? Yea, Is being *eternally damned* a Duty performed to God by the tormented? But whatever our Lord Jeſus ſuffered, was obediential and voluntarily endured: It was God's *commandment* to him, and was in him an act of the higheſt obedience to God; he *pleaſed God* therein: Joh. x. 17. *Therefore*, ſays he, *doth the Father love me, becauſe I lay down my life*; and the Apoſtle Phil. ii. 8. ſays expreſsly, He was *obedient unto death*. His willing ſubjection to God's authority and deſign herein, was that which gave life and energy to his ſufferings. Truly Chriſt's *dying* was the higheſt act of obedience; and what we call *his active obedience*, yields no inſtance that equalleth this. It followeth then, that if Chriſt's obedience could merit, then his death and ſufferings *merited*, becauſe they were ſtrictly *acts of obedience*: His very enduring them was obediential.

(3.) THOUGH death was *due to us* as Sinners, yet death *was not due* to Chriſt, but as it was to be ſatisfactory and meritorious. It was thus propoſed to him by the Father, and thus conſented to by himſelf. He was to bear it as a puniſhment for the ſatisfaction of governing Juſtice, and to merit the Pardon of Sinners; his ſufferings were *a pardoning price*. He had committed no crime, and therefore deſerved no puniſhment,

ment, nor needed any pardon. But he was willing to bear the puniſhment of our crimes, that thereby he might merit our forgiveneſs, in a way conſiſtent with the perfections of God, and conducive to the glory of Divine Government. Hence it is ſaid, *The chaſtiſement of our peace was upon him.* It was upon him as a chaſtiſement for our peace, as its deſigned end. 'Tis true it was for ſin, or it had not been neceſſary, nor yet a puniſhment; but yet it was to purchaſe our ſalvation, or he had not ſubmitted to it. SERM. II. Iſa. liii. 5.

(4.) THE immediate efficacy and operation of Chriſt's ſufferings upon us are owing to this, that they are *meritorious.* Chriſt's death muſt be *ſatisfactory* to God, or he would not have accounted it *meritorious* of peace to us, nor granted us benefits on account thereof. Provoked Juſtice, and the injury done to Divine Government by ſin, ſtood in the Sinner's way, yea ſtood in the way of all merit for good to us. There muſt be a *propitiation for ſin* to God; and this being made to God, it's accepted as a ranſom and price by him; and ſo it operates on the Sinner in a way of merit, conſequential of that ſatisfaction. We are redeemed by Chriſt's blood, as a redeeming price; we are ſaved by it, as meritorious of Salvation: Though it was alſo offered as an atonement, and ſuppoſed to be ſo, ere

Life

SERM. I. Life could be granted to men for the ſake thereof.

(5.) IT were a great reflection on the Father, and upon Chriſt, as well as deſtructive to Sinners, to ſuppoſe, that Chriſt by his death and ſufferings merited nothing for us. *God* is ſtrangely repreſented, if he will have his innocent Son die for ſinners, and yet his death not be allowed meritorious of the releaſe of ſinners. We conceive not of *Chriſt* according to his wiſdom, that he would *make his ſoul an offering for ſin*, and not thereby purchaſe the releaſe of ſinners in his way. And as to the concern of *ſinners*, What avails it them, that Chriſt died to honour Juſtice, if their pardon, adoption, and glory, be not merited thereby? If we ſhould conceive, that Chriſt died for us, and yet thereby *merited not* that we ſhould not die, but live; it would infer, that Chriſt's ſatisfaction did no more than make it conſiſtent with God's glory to ſave believers, but not certain that God would ſave thoſe that believe. I ſay, *believers*, becauſe Chriſt died to purchaſe ſalvation abſolutely, for none but them that would believe; though he purchaſed faith for the Elect, (whereby their happineſs is as ſure, as if abſolutely purchaſed,) and the ſerious offers of ſalvation on the terms of the Goſpel for all men that hear the Goſpel.

I HOPE,

I HOPE, theſe conſiderations will induce you to conclude, that the death and ſufferings of Chriſt are meritorious of ſaving bleſſings for us. Though I grant, Chriſt's *active obedience* was meritorious, yea, and in a very proper ſenſe ſatisfactory too; yet if it were neceſſary, (which it is not,) that we muſt confine the merit of ſalvation to either his active or paſſive obedience, I ſhould eſteem it abundantly ſafer to confine it to his *paſſive obedience*; as *Piſcator*, *Wendelin*, *Gataker*, *Pitcairn*, and many of our greateſt Divines, have done. SERM. I.

I SHALL contract the APPLICATION of what you have heard, and leave the Improvement of ſuch Inferences as theſe to your minds.

1. How great and awful an Evil is Sin! Beſides the defilement which it brings, the debaſement of our rational nature by it, and that obnoxiouſneſs to puniſhment which attends it, we have ſeen, how contrary it is to the holy Nature of God, and what an injury to the glory of his Government. This is that provocation, which eſſential Juſtice required an atonement for, and the Wiſdom of God ſaw neceſſary to puniſh in the moſt awful manner in his very Son. What an offence was that, which when his boundleſs Grace made him willing to forgive, yet his other Perfections would not admit to paſs unpuniſhed,

SERM. I.

nished, that the Government of God might receive no damage by man's impunity? The agony and death of our Redeemer as convincingly testify the Evil of Sin, as the howlings of the damned, yea in many respects far more. This is that, of which *without shedding of blood there is no remission*; yea, for which the blood of Christ alone was a fit *propitiation*: The blood of him alone that was God, could wash it out of God's books, and fetch its Stain out of our consciences. Whatever wonder is displayed in the method of Redemption, proclaims the odiousness and disorder of Sin. Let us then humbly bewail our past offences, wonder that we can *make a mock of Sin*, be in distress till our pardon be sealed to us, watch and be afraid of all Sin for the future, and be restless while this worst of Evils hath any room in our hearts, or any advantage to break out in our lives.

Heb. ix. 22.

2. THE governing Justice of God is strictly exact, and his authority sacred: God is infinite in Mercy, but not to the least detriment of Justice; he bare a good will to the Elect, but will not eclipse his throne in forgiving them. He will be *just*, even *when he pardons*. His Son must *obey in our nature*, if we neglect or fail to obey; his Son must *die in our flesh*, if we offend, and yet obtain remission. Angels irremediably perish for their rebellion, having no God in their nature to atone for them. If sinful Man escape, it's by a satisfaction made

Rom. iii. 25, 26.

made by Chriſt *in their nature*, as their Sponſor: But more of this afterwards. SERM. I.

Let us reverence his laws, tremble at his threats, ſubmit to all he preſcribes, and *ſerve him with reverence and godly fear*; *for our God is a conſuming fire.* Heb. ii. 14, 16. Heb. xii. 28, 29.

3. How amazing is the Love of the Father, in giving his Son for us; and as aſtoniſhing is the Love of Chriſt in giving himſelf for us! The Indignation of God againſt Sin, and the Love of God to Sinners, contend in this inſtance. God takes occaſion to diſplay his Love, while he vindicates the honour of his Juſtice: For *God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet ſinners, Chriſt died for us.* Rom. v. 8. He doth herein not only aſſure us of his Love, but gives to Angels and Men an inſtance of the Infiniteneſs of that Love of his. By this, beyond any other, he proclaims how much he can love. Can you queſtion it, when you conſider him ſo provoked by Sin, when you weigh the dignity and dearneſs of his Son to him, the humble ſtate he was to enter into, and the aſtoniſhing miſeries he was to endure in that ſtate; and this for vile Worms, for careleſs and reſolved Enemies! Well might the Apoſtle ſay, *Herein is Love, not that we loved God, but that God loved us, and ſent his Son to be the propitiation for our ſins.* 1 Joh. iv. 10. Alas! all the creatures Love to God is not worth the name of Love, in com-

SERM. I. pariſon with his Love to us. How ſhould this aggravate our unkindneſs, raiſe our admiring thoughts, heighten our eſteem, unite our hearts to him, render him the object of our ſupreme delight, and render our obedience to his commands exact and pleaſing, yea join'd with the greateſt zeal for his glory and ſerviceableneſs to his intereſts! The Father's Love muſt not be overlook'd, which too many are guilty of, by repreſenting him to their minds as only exacting ſatisfaction from Chriſt, not minding that he provided and gave Chriſt to make that ſatisfaction.

OUR bleſſed Redeemer's Love is alike wonderful and unaccountable. He was not ignorant of what attended his undertaking, when he ſubſcribed it; he knew all the abaſement of his humble ſtate; he underſtood all the bitter ingredients of the Cup, how deep every nail in the Croſs was to pierce, what impreſſions Divine Wrath would make, and what an eclipſe his own veiled Glory would occaſion: But yet his Love was ſufficient to take on him all this weight, and carry him thro' the utmoſt of his undertaking. His kindneſs was not quenched by floods of ſorrow, nor his heart changed when he felt the moſt: With the bitter Cup in his hand, he embraced them, for whoſe ſake he was to drink it; *when Jeſus knew that his hour was come, having loved his own, he loved them*

Joh. xiii. 1

them to the end. What care took he of them? What allowance did he make for the weakneſs of their fleſh? How kindly doth he aſſure them of eternal manſions, with that pathetick accent, *If it were not ſo, I would have told you?* How earneſtly did he *pray for them?* How ſoon doth he viſit them, without upbraiding them with their ſad deſertion? &c. Yea, our bleſſed Jeſus retains the ſame affectionate heart towards us in Heaven, after all he endured on Earth: *He ever lives to make interceſſion for us*; as if that were the very buſineſs and end of his living. How precious ſhould Chriſt be to us? *to us to live,* ſhould be *Chriſt*; his dominion we ſhould acknowledge, and obey his law, who ſo dearly *bought his Government.* Let us be entirely reſigned to him, and with joy endure the utmoſt for his name; for we are *redeemed by his blood.* Let us be careful and ſtudious to imitate him; as what expreſſeth our eſteem of him, and moſt anſwers the great ends of his undertaking: *Rom.* viii. 29. *Tit.* ii. 14.

SERM. I.

Joh. xiv. 2.

Joh. xvii.

Heb. vii. 25.

Phil. i. 21.

Rom. xiv. 9.

4. THAT *ſorer puniſhment* denounced in the Goſpel againſt ſuch as neglect ſalvation by Chriſt, is exceeding juſt. *Of how much ſorer puniſhment, ſuppoſe ye, ſhall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was ſanctified, an unholy thing? &c.* It's equal,

Heb. x. 29.

SERM. I. that they *die in their Sins*, notwithſtanding the remedy, ſince they refuſe it; and that the Wrath of God *abide on them*, who deſpiſe his reconciling Love. But that is not all, the *Goſpel* proportions its Threatnings to the aggravated Sins of unbelief and impenitency: That we *will not come to Chriſt* for the Life he purchaſed by his death, is worſe than our firſt forfeiture of Life. By this, we trample on Chriſt as odious, and eſteem his Blood profane and vile. We ſpurn at the tendereſt Bowels, and contemn the richeſt Grace. We approve of our Apoſtacy, and hug our chains. We downright tell God to his face, I chuſe to be damned, rather than be ſaved by Chriſt. Can any think it ſtrange of ſuch, that their fall ſhould be the lower, their flames the hotter, and the reflections of a tormenting conſcience more penetrating? It is *in flaming fire* Chriſt *will take vengeance on them that obey not the Goſpel, who ſhall be puniſhed with everlaſting deſtruction from the preſence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.* The Blow intended for ſuch, is too great for a created Inſtrument to give; and therefore it will be immediate, by *the preſence of the Lord*; yea it will be ſo awful, as ſhall make *the power* of God's Arm *glorious* in inflicting it. The inſtance muſt undoubtedly be marvellous, by which God intends to glorify any Attribute; and thus we may be ſure, that *ſore indeed* will be that *miſery*,

2 Theſſ. i. 8, 9.

by

by which God will get eternal glory to the ſtrength of his Power, in making wretches miſerable. Oh! tremble at *Goſpel-Vengeance*, and credit *Goſpel-Threatnings*; leſt you be made to feel them, and thereby Chriſt become not only uſeleſs, but alſo terrible to you! What will your caſe be, when he ſhall avenge his deſpiſed blood, and execute that which is *the condemnation!* And know, Oh obſtinate Sinner, thy ruin is as *ſure*, as it is dreadful. For, *how ſhall we eſcape, if we neglect ſo great ſalvation?* There is no poſſibility of eſcaping, thy own awakened mind being Judge. Hath God a dearer Son to give for thee? Will God be a Liar, and be perjured for thy ſake? Can'ſt thou hope for this? as thou muſt, ſince he hath ſo often declared, yea *ſworn*, that the impenitent unbeliever ſhall *never enter into his Reſt.* Undo not thyſelf by hopes, without any Word of God *for them*, yea ſo expreſsly *againſt* his Word, of which ſo many thouſands already feel the certainty. Thou muſt *obey the Goſpel* for Salvation, or its *ſorer vengeance* thou ſhalt eternally undergo.

SERM. I.

Joh. iii. 19.

Heb. ii. 3.

5. THE Faith and Joy of a ſincere Chriſtian are well grounded, notwithſtanding his many offences, and great forfeitures. Our Sins are many and great; can God forgive them? I am exceeding unworthy; how ſhall God deal with me

SERM. I. as his child, or admit my wearing a crown of glory? Can I expect this, or have any joyful hopes concerning it? Truly theſe are neceſſary Challenges, if the *price of ſalvation* be unknown. But conſider, O Soul! that thy pardon and eternal glory are *purchaſed* by the *Obedience* of the Son of God in our nature, and ſecured to thee by the Covenant made and ratified in the virtue of Chriſt's blood. Thy Sins have not diſhonoured God, above the Glory which redounds to him by the ſufferings and merits of thy Redeemer. That was done and ſuffered by Chriſt, which in the balance of Juſtice *more than compenſates* whatever is to be forgiven thee, or is promiſed to thee. No Perfection of God is aggrieved, by any thing the *Goſpel* grants to the perſons it deſigneth. Art thou a godly believer, tho' a weak one? Even thou mayeſt *rejoice in God through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, having now received the atonement.*

Rom. v. 11.

HAVING anſwered the firſt Queſtion, *What is the Obedience of Chriſt, by which we are made righteous?* I am next to conſider the ſecond Queſtion, *What it is to be made righteous by Chriſt's Obedience?* which will be the Subject of another Diſcourſe.

SER-

SERMON II.

Of being made righteous by Chriſt's Obedience.

Rom. v. *the laſt part of the* 19*th Verſe.*

——*So by the Obedience of One ſhall many be made righteous.*

THE firſt Enquiry from theſe words I have already ſpoken to, and ſhewn, *What is the Obedience of Chriſt, by which many ſhall be made righteous?* I ſhall now proceed to the other, which will take in all that I intend to offer on this Subject. SERM. II.

II Qu. *What is it to be made righteous by the Obedience of Chriſt?*

Anſw. THERE is hardly a word in Scripture of ſo various acceptations as the word *Righteouſneſs*. But I ſhall confine myſelf to what the Spirit of God deſigneth principally in the Text. To be *made righteous by Chriſt's obedience* is;

SERM. II.

First, To be *made free from condemnation*, as if we had not ſinn'd, and to be *entitled to acceptance* with God *and eternal glory*, as if we had kept the whole Law; and both *for the ſake of Chriſt's righteouſneſs* imputed to penitent believers for pardon and adoption. It is not, to be made men that never ſinned, for that's impoſſible; nor to be eſteemed men that have perſonally kept the whole Law, for that were falſe; both which the bleſſedneſs by pardon doth demonſtrate; our forgiveneſs ſhews our diſobedience. Or being thus *made righteous* is,

Secondly, By the Merits and Spirit of Chriſt to be *made obedient to the Goſpel*, at leaſt in thoſe things which Chriſt hath graciouſly appointed to be the *Conditions* of our actual enjoyment of ſaving benefits, as the effects of Chriſt's ſole righteouſneſs.

In the *firſt* ſenſe, we are *made righteous* in our *Juſtification*, which is a forenſick act, and infers a relative change of our State from guilty to pardoned, from non-accepted to accepted, and from being void of right to have a right to the eternal inheritance. In the ſenſe of the *ſecond* particular, we are *made righteous*, partly in our *effectual vocation*, and partly in our progreſſive *Sanctification* and Perſeverance. This is by the efficiency of the Spirit of Chriſt, inclining and enabling us to the perfor-

performance of the reſpective Goſpel-conditions: He enableth us to believe for Juſtification, to repent for Pardon, to perſevere in faith and true holineſs for the poſſeſſion of eternal Glory. And both theſe are *by the obedience of Chriſt.* His ſatisfaction and merits have a cauſual influence on both, though theſe effects be produced in a different manner. We muſt not limit our being *made righteous by* Chriſt's *obedience*, below our being *made ſinners by* Adam's *diſobedience*; as far as *Adam* made us ſinners, ſo far *Chriſt* makes us righteous, or the reddition is improper. We are as truly abſolved by *Chriſt*'s obedience, as we were made guilty by *Adam*'s diſobedience; and we are as truly regenerated by *Chriſt*'s obedience, as we were depraved by *Adam*'s diſobedience. In the *firſt* ſenſe, we are made free from the curſe of the Law due to us as Sinners; in the *latter*, we are preſerved from being impenitent ungodly infidels, to whom the Goſpel doth not give a freedom from the curſe, but leaves all ſuch under the ſentence of the Law, yea, and denounceth greater puniſhments againſt them. By the *firſt* we have a full righteouſneſs to ſtand before God in, notwithſtanding the exactneſs of the Law of innocency, and all our faults and defects. By the *ſecond* we are rendered the objects or ſubjects of that full righteouſneſs according to the Goſpel-promiſe, which is the inſtru-

SERM. II.

SERM. II. instrument whereby God bestows it. But hereof more fully in due place. I shall insist most on the first point.

FIRST, To be *made righteous by Christ's obedience*, is to be *made free from condemnation*, as if we had not sinned, and to be *entitled to acceptance* with God *and eternal glory*, as if we had kept the whole Law; and both *for the sake of Christ's righteousness*, imputed to penitent believers for pardon and adoption.

I SHALL endeavour in the shortest way I can, to comprehend the nature and the parts of this particular under the following Propositions.

I *Prop.* ALL men are unrighteous by nature: *There is none righteous, no not one.* We are all transgressors, and therefore each is liable to vengeance: For *all the world is become guilty before God*; ὑποδικος τω Θεω, and he might have arrested, and executed Judgment upon all of us. When innocency ceased, the sentence of the Law took place; and obnoxiousness to misery inevitably followed. This includes a forfeiture of Right to happiness by the Law of works: And to be sure, if it condemns us by its threats, it cannot reward us by its promise; disobedience putting us past a possibility of perfectly obeying, which was the condition of its reward. *Therefore by the deeds*

Rom. iii. 10.

Rom. iii. 19.

Rom. iii. 20.

of

of the law there ſhall no fleſh be juſtified; SERM. *for by the law is the knowledge of ſin.* God II. can never ſpeak peace by it to the Sinner, nor acquit the offender; becauſe by it he condemns for the leaſt Sin, and promiſeth Life to none but the perfectly obedient. By this Law, Sin is not only *known to be Sin*, but Sin is known to bring damnation, and to bar us from happineſs. Hence, though Chriſt's obedience was perfect according to the Law, yet it is not *by the Law* that God pronounceth the believer *juſt*, but by the Goſpel. For *righteouſneſs* Gal. ii. 21. *comes not by the Law*; and *no man is juſtified* iii. 11. *by the Law.*

Exh. BE affected then with that unrighteous ſtate, wherein you all once have been, and the impenitent ſtill remain. Is it a ſmall thing, to have been Rebels againſt the holy Law of your maker? Can you make a light account of being *under the* Gal. iii. 10. *curſe*, which comprehends the utmoſt miſery? This, as a flaming Sword, keeps thee from the tree of life, and with irreſiſtible power binds vengeance on thee, whilſt thou art Chriſtleſs. Divine wrath points to thee, as the obnoxious perſon; and in the mean time, thou haſt no claim to God's favour, no title to God or any ſaving bleſſing. In this ſtate the beſt of you *once were*: And what Grace was it, Eph. ii. 12. that reſcued you out of this extremity? Who can enough adore it? But what is

the

SERM. II. the ſtupidneſs of ſuch among you, that can quietly ſleep in an unrighteous ſtate; yea, and ſo long deſpiſe and refuſe deliverance from it? Hell is your due every moment; and ſhould you die in this condition, as you may without farther warning, neither the mercy of God, nor the merits of Chriſt, will prevent eternal torments.

II *Prop.* GOD is ſo righteous, and ſo jealous of the glory of his government, that his richeſt *mercy* admits the pardon of no offender, nor will grant any ſaving benefits to ſuch as in the leaſt fail in their obedience, but on the account of a *Righteouſneſs*, at leaſt *exactly adequate* to what ſtrict governing Juſtice did enjoin and preſcribe. It muſt be a righteouſneſs of *obedience*, as perfect as the Law-precept required of men; it muſt be a righteouſneſs of *ſatisfaction*, by bearing a puniſhment equivalent to what the Law-threatning denounced againſt ſinners. And becauſe this Law in its precepts and threats was a Law to *men*, and they were *men* that tranſgreſſed; therefore Juſtice required, that the obedience ſhould be yielded, and the puniſhment ſuffered, by and in the human nature. Hence even the Son of God muſt *take our fleſh*, if he would be a Redeemer. The *ſatisfaction* muſt yield as much glory to Juſtice, as the Sin forgiven did injure it: The *merit* muſt be proportioned, in the Scale of Juſtice,

to

to the benefit to be conferred, and that upon offenders; which render'd what was appointed to Chriſt, to be above what the Law required of men. Of this I have ſpoken ſomewhat already, and ſhall have reaſon again to enlarge. *His righteouſneſs is declared*, and he appears *juſt*, when the *juſtifier* of him that believes in Jeſus. *Sin* muſt be *condemned in the fleſh* of Chriſt, by his dying a ſacrifice for it, *that the righteouſneſs of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the fleſh, but after the ſpirit.* SERM. II. Rom. iii. 26. Rom. viii. 3, 4.

Exh. ADORE the Authority and Juſtice of God, notwithſtanding his pardoning Mercy. The Atonement ſpeaks it, neither is it debaſed by all the diſplays of his Grace. We are as ſubject to God, as if he had never ſpared us; and he is ſtill as juſt, as if all mankind were to be damned. If you deſpiſe his Dominion, you ſhall find the edge of his Sword; if you reject the Atonement, the ſeverity of his Juſtice will inſtance itſelf upon you. See then, that you *provoke not the Lord to jealouſy.* 1 Cor. x. 22.

III *Prop.* No grace, nor act of the beſt Saint can be a *ſatisfaction* for the leaſt fault, or a righteouſneſs *meritorious* of the leaſt benefit. All Saints have ſinned; yea, ſins and defects adhere to their beſt duties. Our exacteſt actions cannot *atone* for a paſt crime; becauſe they are no more than what's

SERM. II.

what's at preſent due from us. Imperfect duties cannot *merit*; becauſe they are not, in the eſtimate of governing Juſtice, proportioned to the loweſt benefits: *A reward of debt* can be to none, below him that never ſinned and perfectly obeyeth; though a *reward of grace* is promiſed to the upright. When we have *done all* we now can do, *we are unprofitable ſervants*; and by the Law of works, the *iniquity of our holy things* were enough to bring us under condemnation.

Rom. iv. 4.

Pſal. lviii. 11.

Luk. xvii. 10.

Exh. SEE your need of a greater righteouſneſs than your own, and ſubmit to the way of its application. Be not as they, who *being ignorant of God's righteouſneſs, and going about to eſtabliſh their own righteouſneſs, ſubmitted not themſelves unto the righteouſneſs of God.* They, not knowing the righteouſneſs, which God had contrived and appointed for the ſalvation of fallen man, proudly thought, they could by a tale of Works, made up with operoſe coſtly ſacrifices, *merit life* at the hands of God; and with this conceit they deſpiſed a crucified Chriſt as needleſs, refuſed to believe in Chriſt for Juſtification by his merits, and went on in impenitency, as above the neceſſity of Pardon by his blood: Which impenitent perſiſting in rejecting of Chriſt, was their *non-ſubmiſſion* to the righteouſneſs of God. Oh the danger of a heart too proud, and a will too ſtubborn, to ſtoop

Rom. x. 3.

to

to Christ and his Gospel! Alas, our own garments are too scant for a covering; and unless we accept of a whole Christ, we shall be naked, notwithstanding the largeness of his robe. *His stripes* will not *heal us*, if we *return not to this Shepherd and Bishop of our souls.* A righteousness to procure acceptation, or to merit Life, we cannot work out: But blessed be God, Christ *is the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believeth*; the end of the *ceremonial Law*, as what the types signified; the end of the *Law of works*, as being the scope and issue of it; for if it had been perfectly obeyed by Man, right to *impunity*, and its *reward*, was the utmost which that Law could confer on innocent man. And blessed be God, Christ hath by his obedience *merited* both these; and all that will truly believe, shall in Christ's right be entitled to both; though for any thing wrought by them, they could never attain either impunity or glory. If you peruse the following verses you will find, that God hath put us *past all solicitousness* concerning the sufficiency and certainty of a Christ, who hath a fulness of righteousness for the salvation of sinners: But the thing incumbent on us to be *solicitous about*, is, that we comply with the Gospel, that we may be saved by his righteousness. *If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe with thine heart, thou shalt be saved; for with the*

SERM. II.

1 Pet. ii. 24, 25.

Rom. x. 4.

Rom. x. 9, 10.

SERM. II. *the heart man believeth unto righteouſneſs, and with the mouth confeſſion is made unto ſalvation.* Without theſe, neither his coming to die, nor his reſurrection from death, will avail us to ſalvation. Oh then, accept of Chriſt, and yield up yourſelves to him, and to a due and faithful confeſſion of him as your Lord.

IV *Prop.* CHRIST, by the gracious diſpenſation of God as our Law-giver, was admitted, and in our nature did *ſo fully anſwer* the demands of governing Juſtice, as that, to its own very Glory, it admits the Grace of God to exert itſelf, in forgiving believing ſinners, and in conferring on them ſaving benefits in the righteouſneſs of Chriſt. It was not ſo ſmall a matter, as moſt account it, to bring Juſtice and pardoning Mercy to conſiſt; to honour the Government of God, and ſave believing ſinners, who before were ſentenced to die. But having ſpoken to ſome part of this Propoſition in my former Diſcourſe, I ſhall reduce it to theſe particulars, which I ſhall briefly hint at.

1. IT was in our offending *nature* that Chriſt anſwered the demands of Juſtice, tho' it was not in our *perſon*. For *God ſent his Son in the likeneſs of ſinful fleſh.* If without this, it had been poſſible to vindicate the Government of God in general; yet without aſſuming our nature, it would not

Rom viii. 3.

have

have been a vindication of the Government of God over *men* in particular; the sufferings had not been a satisfaction for human offences, as human. SERM. II.

2. NOTHING was abated to Christ, that governing Justice exacted; the substantials of the Law were inserted into the rule of his active and passive obedience, and Justice adjusted his work to his wages. There's no common nor special benefit promised, or given, on the account of his obedience, to any, but the value of his obedience is proportionable thereto; though yet the benefits much exceed what *Adam* forfeited; and therefore his obedience must transcend what was enjoined man by the Law of works.

3. GOD's Government and Justice were not only vindicated by Christ's obedience, but greatly honoured. Oh the lustre cast on God's laws hereby! Never did the authority of God's *precepts* appear so royal, as when God *in flesh* so accurately obeyed them; even so far as to die for sinners. Never was the awfulness of God's *penal sanctions* so discovered, as in the tears, the sweat, the agony, and blood of his glorious and beloved Son. There's no such instance of the riches of God's *premiant sanction*, as in the rewards which our Saviour received. How exalted is his human nature above Angels! and how great are his rewards in his members! Yea, there's no blessing given

SERM. II.

to loſt man, but it's on his account. What an atteſting Echo have you? when on his ſaying, *Father, glorify thy name!* there came a voice from heaven, ſaying, *I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again.* Chriſt ſpake his part but juſt before, when he had inſpected the united force of terrors juſt beſetting him: *Now is my ſoul troubled; Father, ſave me from this hour! but for this cauſe came I unto this hour:* As if he had ſaid, "As heavy as it preſſeth, as awful as it is, yet *Father, glorify thy name!* "Abate nothing that will make for thy "honour, however my fleſh trembleth, "and my ſoul is diſtreſſed: Be thou great, "however low I muſt be brought: Spare "not for my crying, and abate nothing "that will tend to make thy Authority ſacred, and thy Juſtice exact." The Father anſwers, "I have purſued the intereſt "of my Glory hitherto, in thy debaſement, "poverty, contempt, ſorrows, ſhame, "temptations, and torments, which are "now juſt a finiſhing; my *Sword* is giving "its utmoſt blow; and then I will be glorious in exalting and rewarding thee: I'll "get my *remunerative* Juſtice as great a "name in thy triumphs, as my *punitive* "Juſtice hath acquired in thy debaſements." So Chriſt explains it afterwards: *Now ſhall the prince of this world be caſt out; and when I am lifted up, I will draw all men to me.*

John xii. 28.

4. THOUGH

4. THOUGH all was fulfilled by Christ, when he was appointed to it, yet it was by a gracious dispensation of God, as Law-giver, that Christ was allowed to work this righteousness for the salvation of sinners. The Law-giver is above the Law: And tho' the Law knew no Sponsor, whose obedience should procure pardon, and save the guilty; *alius* was *aliud* in its account; *noxa caput sequitur*, is its language; the punishment must fall on the sinner, it could appoint no other to bear it; and imputing to the sinner what another endureth, is above its dialect: Yet God, the Law-giver, had not signified his whole will by the Law of works. He had reserved a Prerogative, whereby he could secure the glory of his Government, and spare the Rebel; satisfy Justice, and not destroy the Sinner; and be as glorious in forgiving, as in punishing. To him the *satisfaction* was made, and by him accepted. And hence the sinner is not free, as soon as the satisfaction was made; but it's *when*, and on what terms, the Law-giver and Sponsor would adjust; yea, and the release comes to the sinner as a *forgiving* act. SERM. II. Heb. x. 7.

Exh. ADORE the Wisdom and Grace of God. Oh! what Grace, that would transfer the punishment! What Wisdom, that contrived a way to place it so, that God should be satisfied, and yet his Grace be free! The Sinner saved, and yet not tempt-

SERM. II. ed to rebel! The Sufferer repaid in Glory, ſuited to what he did and endured! The Redeemed kept humble as pardoned, tho' the Pardon was granted on a valuable price! The Gift ſo beſtowed, as to exert authority, and neceſſitate diligence; and yet nothing done on the Receiver's part to purchaſe the Gift, or to rob Grace of its Glory! It's comprehenſively expreſſed by the Apoſtle, *In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveneſs of ſins, according to the riches of his grace; wherein he hath abounded towards us in all wiſdom and prudence.*

Eph. i. 7, 8.

V. *Prop.* THE righteouſneſs of Chriſt in all reſpects is *perfect* and compleat, yet Chriſt's righteouſneſs is variouſly denominated from thoſe different reſpects. However variouſly we conceive thereof, it's every way perfect; it's chargeable with no defect, nor ſubject to any challenge.

I. IT is perfect, if you conſider it as a mere conformity to the preceptive part of the Moral Law, in which reſpect it is the ſame as *holineſs*. He was *holy, harmleſs, undefiled, ſeparate from ſinners.* He was *habitually* holy, above *Adam*; yea, above Angels; none ſo *full of grace and truth*, as he: No mind ſo filled with light, *in actu primo*, even from the very beginning; no heart ſo inlaid with the divine image, and ſo inflamed with love, as his. He had *the*

Heb. vii. 26.

Joh. i. 14.

Spirit

Spirit without measure: He had no taint of evil in his constitution; even in the womb, he was *that holy thing*; and when the Tempter assaulted him with the most skilful violence, he had *nothing in him.* He super-eminently obeyed to an *Iota*, all that was required of him, or competent to his Person; and this, without any defect in the manner, and to the utmost extent of the precept. Thus *compleatly holy* was Christ; which holiness went into the matter of his righteousness, and is often called so: He gave God his utmost due, as a holy Law-giver. SERM. II. Joh iii 34. Luke i. 35. Joh. xiv. 30.

2. IT was a perfect righteousness, as the performed *condition* of the reward promised him in the Covenant of Redemption. Whatever was promised to Christ, either for himself or his members, was promised upon certain *conditions*; some of which were a due undergoing of the bitterest *sufferings* threatned in the Law of works, others were included in that of his *active obedience*. A penal Sanction in case of his failure, had no room in the Law of mediation, because of the impossibility of his non-performance; and therefore, a right to impunity is of as little concern: But Christ's *active* and *passive* obedience, became formally *a compleat righteousness*; as what he did and suffered, was an exact fulfilling of the *condition* of the reward in the Sanction. He took our nature, he made his soul an

SERM. II. offering for ſin, he honoured the Law, he glorified God, he did *all the work* which was given him to do, and drank the dregs of the Cup, which was appointed him to drink: In a word, he *fulfilled all righteouſneſs*; even all that, for which he was to be exalted, or his ſeed made happy; nothing was omitted by him, or abated to him.

Mat. iii. 15.

3. THIS righteouſneſs of Chriſt, as the performed condition of the Reward, was a *federal righteouſneſs*, above what was to be man's righteouſneſs by the Law of works; which could not be, but that the *conditions* conſented to by Chriſt in the Covenant of Redemption, were *other*, and *greater*, than what were required of *Adam* by the Covenant of works. I ſhall give you a few of many inſtances of *conditions*, appointed to Chriſt in the Covenant of Redemption, above what the Law of works required. The Law of works did not require the Perſon obeying or ſuffering, to be the eternal *Son of God in our nature*; but the Covenant of Redemption required this. Should I name no more, this would fully prove the point. But I add, The Law of works did not exact an Obedience *above* what innocent *Adam* was able to perform; but the Covenant of Redemption did this; and Chriſt ſo obeyed in our nature, (not needleſsly,) as muſt fill the Angels with admiration to ſee themſelves outdone. The Co-

venant

venant of works did not exact Punishment *even to death*, from the same person as still yielded *perfect obedience*; but the Covenant of Redemption did this. The Law of works did not require, or appoint a *vicarious* punishment or obedience from a *Sponsor* for others, but limited both to the persons originally subject to the Law; whereas the Covenant of Redemption appointed this. The Law of works did not command the Sufferings of any, as a *reconciling Propitiation*; but the Law of Mediation did this. My reason for that is, The Law of works did, by its threats, denounce vengeance against Sin; but this was not by a Precept, upon obedience whereto the Sufferer could merit peace and reconciliation: Whereas the Law of Mediation appointed Christ's death for a *propitiatory offering*, and in dying he yielded the highest act of *obedience to a Precept*; and this, *to make Reconciliation*. The Covenant of works did, as a *condition* of impunity and reward, enjoin obedience to no Law, but that which *Adam* was under, *viz.* the Law of works, and the Positive one, prohibiting the eating of the *Tree of knowledge of good and evil*: But the Covenant of Redemption required obedience to the Ceremonial Law, *&c.* The Law of works appointed no more obedience than governing Justice, as such, had suited to the rewards of that Covenant: But as the Covenant of Redemption had far higher re-

SERM. II.

Joh. xiv. 31. Heb. ii. 17. Col. i. 20.

SERM. II. wards, ſo it ordained ſuitable conditions. The Law of works appointed no obedience after Sin, as a *meritorious condition* of obtaining forfeited benefits; but the Covenant of Redemption did this.

WE may eaſily perceive, that the *conditions* preſcribed to our Redeemer, *much differ'd* from thoſe the Law of works required; and ſince Chriſt fulfilled all theſe, his federal righteouſneſs *exceeds* that which the Law of works preſcribed. If you aſk, Why Chriſt's righteouſneſs *muſt thus exceed* what the Law of works ordained? I anſwer, It is becauſe it is a greater thing to redeem an offender, than to continue an innocent perſon's right to impunity: And it is more to purchaſe greater bleſſings for one that hath forfeited all good, than it is to continue leſſer bleſſings tho' with ſome addition, to one that hath not forfeited: Yea, and reconciliation is more difficult, than maintaining peace before any enmity.

4. CHRIST's righteouſneſs was perfect, as it was his *adjudged juſt right* to the rewards promiſed him, for performing the foreſaid conditions. The dueneſs of the reward to Chriſt in a way of ſtrict Juſtice, is his righteouſneſs, or *jus ad præmium*. It was to him a reward of Juſtice, and not of Grace; becauſe Juſtice proportioned the conditions to the reward, and the reward to the conditions: If it were not ſo, governing Juſtice never glorified or diſcovered

vered itself in the dispensing of rewards. SERM. II.

To finish this point, consider, (1.) The reward to which Christ hath a right, includes all that was promised to Christ, or to others, on the account of his satisfaction and merits. It not only includes, that he should be *exalted*, and have *a name above every name*, with whatever glory or homage was to be rendered to *him as a Saviour*: But it comprehends all by the Father promised, and by himself bequeathed, to *his members*; as Justification, Adoption, the sanctifying Spirit, Perseverance, and eternal Glory to his regenerate Seed; as also Regeneration and Faith to all the Elect, that they may be raised to be a Seed to him, and be united with him. (2.) The Lord Jesus was solemnly adjudged to have performed all the conditions, and to have a legal Right to all this reward. His righteousness was adjudged to be perfect, and he (as 'tis foretold,) was *justified*. God by a Voice declared this; but it was still more manifest in his Resurrection, and yet more in his solemn enthroning *in the heavens*, where he *is set at the right hand of God*: Yea, he had *authority given him* to execute his own right.

Phil. ii. 9.

Isa. l. 8.

Heb. viii. 1.

Joh. v. 27.

Exh. REJOICE and glory in the Perfection of Christ's righteousness. You see, that in all respects it is compleat. The Law of Redemption prescribed such terms, as became God's essential Justice to propose:

SERM. II.

poſe: To theſe governing Juſtice annexed a due reward, upon performing the conditions: And the perfectly holy Jeſus had a right to all the reward, and was ſolemnly adjudged to have performed the conditions, and to have that Right to the reward. So that his Right is founded in a full performance of the conditions, which includes a full conformity to the Law of works, yea, and what far exceeds it. In this then we may glory; there is no blot in his performance, there is no flaw in his right. Can Sinners need any more, than this applied? for it will ſerve to all the purpoſes it's deſigned to. Oh Chriſtian, honour it, by laying the ſtreſs of thy hopes and comfort on it, and clearing thy intereſt in it above all good: It anſwers guilt, and weakneſs; yea, and thy want of all things, except that, without which it cannot be applied to thee, nor its effects attained, *viz.* a penitential Faith. When thy *Body* rotteth in the grave *becauſe of Sin*, thy *Spirit* will be ſafe and *eternally live, on the account of* this *righteouſneſs*: Thou mayeſt chearfully venture thy Soul upon it.

Rom. viii. 10.

VI *Prop.* THE Lord Jeſus is, and always will be, poſſeſſed of this righteouſneſs in his own Perſon. *In the Lord have I righteouſneſs and ſtrength*: And with reſpect to this it is ſaid, *our Redemption is in Chriſt*, by which we are *juſtified*. The meriting

Iſa. xlv. 24.

Rom. iii. 24.

meriting acts are over, as acts, but the Merit never ceaseth. His sufferings are past, but the Righteousness acquired thereby remains. Nor is it only their virtue simply that continues, but the righteousness or right founded thereon abideth. He hath a right to Faith for all the Elect who are yet uncalled; he hath a title to Pardon for all true believers; he hath a right to eternal Glory for all persevering Saints. There is our Right best secured. It is for the *righteousness* that is *in Christ*, that we are acquitted and adopted; and on it, as in him, we must still depend. SERM. II.

Exh. SINNERS and Saints, look to Christ as having in him a full righteousness. Let this commend him to your acceptance and trust. Sinners, you need him on this very account, to answer for your unrighteousness: All his offers and calls should have power with you from this very motive, he hath a perfect Righteousness: It were else in vain, to believe in him; it were to no purpose, to repent and turn to him: Were not he by this righteousness *mighty to save* thee, an answer to his call might not be expected. But know with assurance, that he is *a Fountain* deep enough for thy *uncleanness*. The *Sun of righteousness* hath *healing in his wings*, and peace and glory in his power. You may trust *the promises*, by which the Gospel allureth you to Christ; for, as amazing as the Good is which they con-

Zech. xiii. 1.

Mal. iv. 2.

SERM. II. contain, they are by his righteousness, *in him, Yea, and in him, Amen.* But take care of separating his person from his righteousness: You must accept of him, as a whole Christ, if you hope for good by his righteousness; and your Faith must be directed to him in a firm dependance, and entire subjection, or he'll be to you as unuseful, as if he had not this fulness of righteousness.

2 Cor. i. 20.

VII *Prop.* ALL Graces and saving benefits are dispensed to men *in the righteousness* of Christ. By his Satisfaction, he rendered it consistent with the perfections of God, to visit blind Souls with his light, and to surprize the dead with spiritual life. On Christ's account, the Spirit descends, to strive with the rebellious, and awake the sleepy: His regenerating influences are the effects of Christ's merits, he acts as *the Spirit of Christ.* I do not mean, that Christ's righteousness is *imputed to men* in order to the working of Faith in them, as it is in order to Pardon; you may as well say, it's imputed to men in order to the preaching of the Gospel to them, for that's an effect of Christ's righteousness: But these are the result of a divine constitution, wherein Christ is acknowledged, but no right in men supposed. The first Grace is absolute, and an arbitrary act, as to any claim the sinner hath. Tho' Christ hath a right

right to the Elect's being brought to believe, yet he transfers not his right to the Elect, who till they believe are not united to him, and so are *aliens* to his righteousness. But God hath an eye to the Merits of Jesus, in all his grants and gifts from first to last, from the least to the greatest. When he *forgives Sin*, it is a rendering to us what is purchased *by Christ's blood*; it is a giving forth of what he hath bought: We are *made Kings and Priests*, as a proper reward to Christ, and as a testimony to his righteousness. SERM. II. Eph. iv. 32. Rev. i. 6.

Exh. SAY of every saving benefit, and of all graces, *This I receive, because the Lord Jesus hath a full righteousness.* The Heavens had been Brass as to vital influences, but for this; the Word had been a dead condemning Letter, but for this: My Sins had been eternally sealed up among his treasures, Pledges of his Love to my Soul I had never found, my Prayers would have been excluded audience, christian Hopes and Comforts I had not intermeddled with; but that Christ is righteous, yea, perfectly so. But because his righteousness is great, I have found Healings when wounded, Strength when weak, my Prayers have had frequent audience; God hath not refused me communion with himself, mine iniquities are removed as a cloud, I joy in God's favour, I glory in his fulness, and have lively hopes to be ever with him.

And

SERM. II. And ſhould not that be owned by us in all, which is the Conſideration upon which all is given?

VIII *Prop.* THE righteouſneſs of Chriſt is *differently applied*, and *operative*, as the Goſpel diſtinguiſheth the promiſed benefits with reſpect to the various conditions of ſuch, who are the perſons deſcribed in the promiſes. For explication of this, note,

1. THE Goſpel-promiſes diſtinguiſh the benefits that come by Chriſt, and deſcribe the objects of each. The Promiſes are various; and thoſe are all Goſpel-promiſes that are made to fallen man *for Chriſt's ſake*. To be a Promiſe to *fallen man*, and not Goſpel; to be for *Chriſt's ſake*, and not a Goſpel-promiſe, are in the nature of the thing, impoſſible. The variety of the Promiſes is obvious, and the Perſons to whom they are made are not alike deſcribed. Some are made to one grace, ſome to another grace; ſome on one condition, ſome on another. Juſtification is promiſed to *believers*; Pardon to the *penitent*; Returns of Prayer to him that prays *fervently*, and *in faith*; Glory to the *perſevering*; abundant Glory, or *reaping liberally*, to him that *ſows liberally*, that is, who is abundant in fruitfulneſs; he that *hungers after righteouſneſs*, ſhall be *filled*; and the like. Each of the Promiſes are made in Chriſt's right; they

Mar. i. 4. Jam. v. 16. Gal. vi. 9. 2 Cor. ix. 6. Mat. v. 6.

are

are but an Inventory of Christ's claim; nay, they were made with respect to his Merits. If God could *make a Promise* of saving benefits to Sinners without an eye to Christ's Satisfaction, as the consideration of making that Promise; I doubt, it will go too far to prove, that he may *perform that Promise* without an eye to his Satisfaction. The same Objection will not lie against a mere Decree or Purpose, to give such benefits in and by Christ; for this Purpose gives no man a right to the benefit, but the Promise doth give a right: And to suppose a Sinner's right without respect to Christ's righteousness, seems to weaken the necessity of his Satisfaction and Merits, who is *given to be a Covenant*; that is, for his sake the Covenant is made, and by him it is confirmed and executed. But however various the Promises are, they grant in his right; they are Christ's legacies, they are bequeathed by his Testament; and therefore argue, that the respective blessings contained therein, are his proper goods, given out by the Promises as his donative instrument, and upon terms which the Father and he thought fittest to prescribe, as rendring the state of the receivers such, as they judged most subservient to infinitely wise and holy purposes.

SERM. II.

Isa. xlii. 6.

2. It is Christ's righteousness, that exerts itself, and operates, in conferring the benefits included in these various Promises.

This

SERM. II.

This empties itſelf in all thoſe channels, and influenceth by each of thoſe means. The bleſſing conferred is a diſplay of his Merits, as the procuring cauſe, whatever power the thing is effected by, or way it is effected in. Chriſt's righteouſneſs is applied in pardon, in adoption, in the perſeverance of penitent believers. This is applied in the anſwer of every Prayer; this is as truly in all additional *degrees of grace* in ſome Saints, as in any meaſure in every Saint; yea, in the augmented *degrees of glory*, as in a ſtate of glory. Hence it is paſt doubt, that unleſs we ſay, ſome ſpiritual and heavenly benefits are given, not by or for Chriſt's righteouſneſs; or that his righteouſneſs may be equally applied, and yet not produce equal effects; then we muſt conclude, the righteouſneſs of Chriſt is not in the ſame degree applied unto all, to whom it yet may be applied to ſaving purpoſes. It is applied to no true believer, but that it ſecures to him a deliverance from hell, an acceptance of his perſon and duties, perſeverance in faith, and the kingdom of heaven at laſt: But are all as greatly beloved as *Daniel*, as mighty with God as *Moſes*, or *Jacob*? Had he that was *Ruler of five cities*, as great Glory, as he that was made *Ruler of ten cities*? And ſurely the very preheminence in theſe reſpects, is owing to the righteouſneſs of Chriſt applied. *Rev.* i. 5, 6.

Luk. xix. 17, 19.

Exh.

SERM. II.

Exh. BE careful and industrious to be the *described objects* of the several benefits you desire, according as the Promises describe the persons, and to whom they are made; yet *expect each benefit* by Christ's Righteousness, when you are the described objects of those benefits according to the Gospel-ordination. In vain do you expect the benefit promised, if you are not *the persons* to whom the Promise grants it; for the Promise doth as truly exclude the wrong person from its blessing, as it assures it to the right person. But by what doth the Promise describe you to be *the person* it speaks of? It is not by your name, but by your character; even your being such a one, as Christ declares by the Promise, he will give the benefit to. Would you be *filled?* be then one that *hungers* after righteousness. Would you be *pardoned* for Christ's sake? see that you be *penitent believers*; for it is to such only Christ's righteousness is promised to be applied for pardon. Would you *reap plentifully?* then *sow plentifully*; for if you be of them that *sow sparingly*, God doth not say it to you, that *you shall reap plentifully*. The like I may say of every other Promise that is conditional; for therein God moves us to duty by benefits; he induces us to what we are more backward to, by what we more esteem and desire. Election knows our names, the Promises appoint our qualifications:

2 Cor. ix. 6.

SERM. II. And do not think thou canſt plead Chriſt's righteouſneſs to obtain the good promiſed, if thou art not ſuch a one as the Promiſe deſcribes; for in making theſe Promiſes, Chriſt hath fixed the way how the effects of his righteouſneſs ſhall be diſpenſed; and by theſe he requires us to guide our expectations, or they do not anſwer the end of his publication of them.

BUT when thou art, by the Grace and Spirit of Chriſt, the characterized man to whom the Promiſe belongs, *expect the bleſſing* as the effect of Chriſt's righteouſneſs, and not of thine own. The Promiſe had not been made to thee, but for that: It is in his right the bleſſing is conferred, whenever any partake thereof; which adds ſweetneſs as well as certainty thereto. The Spirit frames the *Veſſel*, but Chriſt affords the *Oil*. By the operation of the Holy Ghoſt thou art rendred the deſigned object of the Promiſe; but look to Chriſt, as the Procurer of the good which the Promiſe is to convey: But more of this hereafter.

IX *Prop.* IN and by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, they that ſincerely believe, are, upon God's pardoning of them, as *free from condemnation*, as if they had never ſinned; and are as fully accepted and entitled to eternal Glory, as if they had kept the whole Law. For *there is no Condemnation to them that are in Chriſt Jeſus, who walk not*

Rom. viii. 1.

not after the flesh, but after the spirit. These are in that state, wherein the Curse is restrained from arresting them: Yea, they are *heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.* The Gospel-Covenant is their Charter of right, which is secured by the death of Christ, the oath of God, and sacramental Seals. The death of Christ is to be considered, not only as what purchased the Covenant-blessings, (of which I have spoken before,) but also as what *ratifies* the Covenant to our faith: By death it is irrevocable as a *Testament*; and it must needs be *sure*, or the Lord of Glory had never died to secure the ends of it. His death is too great a thing, to admit a doubt of the certainty of that Charter, by which the effects of that death are granted. And Christians therefore being thus free, and thus accepted and entitled, it proclaims them righteous.

SERM. II.

Rom. viii. 17.

Exh. BE comforted notwithstanding your faults and weaknesses, whilst your Hearts are upright in God's Covenant. What is not a just challenge to the Sincerity of thy faith, ought not to make thee conclude thyself accursed, or quit thy hopes of glory: Failings may cause mournings that we are so *imperfect*, when they ought not to perplex us as if we were in a *lost* condition. The same mouth that delivered the *curse* against Sinners in the Law, hath published *forgiveness*, and applied redemption

Gal. iii. 13, 14.

SERM. II. to believers (tho' Sinners) by the Goſpel. If your *faults* be objected, Chriſt hath anſwered them: If the *weakneſs* of graces be objected, Chriſt hath made up that: If the greatneſs of Goſpel-benefits be objected, it is Chriſt hath purchaſed them; and they are beſtowed, not for thy graces, but for Chriſt's obedience, though it be to ſuch as even thou art, if a ſincere penitent, that they are given: For the Goſpel-rule doth only appoint the perſons who receive the benefits, but not ordain us to make the ſatisfaction for the Sin to be pardoned, or to purchaſe the Glory to be received. Wilt thou not let Chriſt appoint his own Legatees to his own bequeathments? and rejoice in the gifts, whilſt thou art the perſon to whom he declares they belong? If he had promiſed heaven to a *mere Sinner* as ſuch, thou oughteſt as a Sinner to expect it with joy: But he hath promiſed it to all believing Saints, however imperfect; and muſt not thou with comfort look for it, and not quit thy hopes, till thou ceaſe to be a believing Saint? Yea, he hath miniſtred further to thy joy, That he will influence thy Soul by his warnings againſt apoſtacy, by ſacraments, and by conſtant ſupplies; ſo that thou ſhalt perſevere.

X *Prop.* CHRISTIANS become thus righteous upon believing, by the righteouſneſs of Chriſt *imputed to them* in their Juſtification;

tification; and by the continuance of this Imputation they remain righteous. Upon our firſt *believing*, we are *juſtified*; and there is a conſtant *Imputation* of Chriſt's righteouſneſs to believers for their continued Juſtification. Did men ceaſe to be believers, God would ceaſe to impute the righteouſneſs of Chriſt to them. Did God ceaſe to impute Chriſt's righteouſneſs, men would ceaſe to be juſtified; and did we ceaſe to be juſtified, we ſhould be ſubject to condemnation. But bleſſed be God, he will cauſe the true believer to perſevere in faith, and ſo he ſhall remain in a juſtified ſtate. God will preſerve the habit of Faith; he will enable him to frequent acts of faith, and ſtill prevent damning Infidelity: He will keep thee from a prevailing diſtruſt and *rejection* of Chriſt as a Saviour, and from reigning diſobedience to him as thy Lord,

SERM. II.

Rom. iii. 26.

Luk. xxii. 32.

I SHALL explain this great truth of *Juſtification by the imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, which may be conceived of according to the following heads.

1. THERE is a making us righteous, as it is *giving a believer a right* to pardon, abſolution from the curſe, adoption and acceptance, which is by imputing the righteouſneſs of Chriſt to the believer. We muſt be *made righteous*, before a juſt God can pronounce us ſo, or deal with us as ſuch; there muſt be *a right to Pardon*, ere God will

SERM. II. will pardon: This right to Pardon is given, by God's imputing to us the righteouſneſs of Chriſt; and the effect of that imputing act ſeems to be the firſt conſideration in the Change made in our ſtate as juſtified.

FOR the better apprehending of this, you may remember I have before informed you, that Chriſt's righteouſneſs may be conſidered; (1.) As the full *performance* of the conditions of the Covenant of Redemption, which included a full conformity to the Law of works; yea, and more. And, (2.) As an *adjudged right* to the promiſed reward, for his performance of thoſe conditions. Now both theſe are *imputed* to the believer in this firſt conſideration, of *giving a believer a right* to Pardon, *&c.*

(1.) THE righteouſneſs of Chriſt, as it was the *performance* of the conditions of our Salvation, is *mediately imputed* to the believer. God adjudgeth, that what Chriſt did and ſuffered for the actual remiſſion of Sinners, was really done and ſuffered *for us*; it really belongs to us, and we are the deſigned objects of that actual remiſſion, to procure which for us that obedience was rendred. *God ſo loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoſoever believeth in him, ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting Life.* Here we ſee, that God gave his Son to do and ſuffer what he did, that *believers* thereby might not periſh, but

Joh. iii. 16.

eternally

eternally live. Now being by grace *believers*, that we may have *a right* not to periſh, but live, we have what the Son ſo given did and ſuffered, reckoned and accounted to us: God looks on what Chriſt did, as done *for us*; and eſteems us believers, to be them whom his Son did that for: And therefore by his gracious ordination, we are the very Perſons that have *a right* to the Pardon of thoſe Sins, for which we were liable to periſh, and excluded from life. I ſay, Chriſt's very performance of the conditions is imputed *mediately*, in this manner: If one give me my Liberty, which he voluntarily purchaſed for me at a dear rate, he *mediately* gives me what he paid for my ranſom, though *immediately* I receive my liberty, and a right thereto; whereas the redeeming Price was paid *to my detainer*, in whoſe hands I was captive. So it was *to God* that Chriſt made Satisfaction, and yielded the meriting Price: yet it is applied and reckoned ſo to the believer, that he receives the ſame bleſſings thereby, as if he himſelf had rendred it; becauſe it was for his Title to thoſe benefits that it was rendred by Chriſt. Yea, by this Imputation it becomes his Security for all ſaving benefits, and is as pleadable with God by him, with reſpect to what is purchaſed for believers thereby, as if he had endured and performed the things Chriſt did: Since God adjudgeth, he is the perſon, in whoſe ſtead Chriſt

SERM. II.

SERM. II. died and obeyed, that even he might be entitled to life, and might not die; Chriſt having *died for us, that we ſhould live by him.* We have hereby the benefits of his Death, and have his *Death* to ſecure thoſe benefits, yea, and as the foundation of our right to thoſe benefits. Hence we are ſaid to *have redemption and forgiveneſs through his Blood; by whom we have now received the atonement,* [καταλλαγην, the reconciliation:] And herein the Blood which did reconcile, is applied, it being ſhed and accepted *to be a propitiation through faith therein.* The virtue of this Blood ſtill remains, though the act of ſhedding is long ſince paſt; and that very act of ſhedding is ſtill ſo referred to, in the communication of the benefits to ſuch for whom it was ſhed, that it is ſtill called a *Blood of ſprinkling*; not as now ſprinkled on us as material Blood, but as it ſpeaks thoſe *better things, for us* in Chriſt's interceſſion, and *to us* in the promiſes, and as we *come to it*, by believing therein as our Security in all we receive; it being ſhed for us, that we might have *a right* to Pardon thereby, as the procuring cauſe. It was given *to God* as a Satisfaction; 'tis given *to us* as Chriſt's Blood triumphing in our peace. Though God doth not adjudge, that believers made Satisfaction by it as *their Blood*, yet he accounteth it that, which is actually *ſatisfactory for them*, being deſigned and accepted to be ſo; and therefore they are therein

1 Theſſ. v. 10.

Eph. v. 11.

Rom. v. 11.

Rom. iii. 25.

Heb. xii. 24.

therein adjudged to be entitled to Pardon, In the ſame manner I might ſpeak of *Adoption, &c.* but one inſtance ſufficeth. By this you ſee, that Chriſt's righteouſneſs, as it is his active and paſſive obedience, the δικαιωμα, or the performance of the legal conditions of life and pardon, is applied in the manner it is truly capable of being applied: Here the virtue and merit of it is diſplayed and operative; the deſigned end of it is obtained; God expreſsly acknowledgeth and rewardeth it, in what he beſtows; it's owned and relied on by the believer, as the price of peace, and merit of all good; it's made the Soul's ſecurity and plea, as to all its hopes and enjoyments. *Rom.* v. 18. And then, SERM. II.

(2.) THE righteouſneſs of Chriſt, as it is his *adjudged right* to his Seed's pardon, abſolution from theLaw-curſe, acceptance and adoption, is *immediately imputed* to believers, as his regenerate ſeed, and members of his myſtical body. This right is eſteemed, yea, made *theirs*; they have not merely the benefits given them, but they are inveſted in Chriſt's right to thoſe benefits. Chriſt's righteouſneſs is *Jus adjudicatum ad præmium*; he acquired a right to the reward, and it was adjudged that he had that right; upon his perfect obedience he was *juſtified.* Now part of the Reward was, That all the Elect ſhould become his actual ſeed, and be made believers: And alſo, That all his

SERM. II. his actual ſeed, even believers, ſhould be forgiven, abſolved, adopted, *&c.* Chriſt therefore hath as great a right to this, as to be exalted; yea, it's part of his Glory. This right he carried into Heaven with him; this right he pleads in his Interceſſion, not as what is to be tried and argued anew, but as what is already adjudged; yet it's ſtill to be executed, and the bleſſings he hath that right to, are to be diſpenſed. Believers therefore are not only pardoned, yea, they not only have a right to Pardon, by the promiſe of pardon to believers, but they have *Chriſt's right* to that Pardon, even his *adjudged right* that believers ſhall be pardoned. This righteouſneſs is communicable *more immediately*, than the very acts are whereby that right was acquired; it's transferred to them, but without an alienation from Chriſt. This is included in that *Gift of righteouſneſs*, and is that δικαιωσις ζωης, of which the Apoſtle ſpeaks. In ſhort, his Obedience muſt be ſuppoſed to loſe its efficacy, and his Title be reverſed, if his living members fail of Pardon; one article in his Covenant, as his reward, being this, that *by his knowledge ſhall my righteous Servant juſtify many, for he ſhall bear their Iniquities.*

Rom. v. 17, 18.

Iſa. liii. 11.

IT may be you will better apprehend the whole by this familiar Inſtance. A perſon purchaſeth a Thouſand Pounds a year for a valuable Price, and hath by Covenants

venants a legal ſure title thereto; he that purchaſed gives me by a deed of gift, Twenty Shillings a year of that eſtate, to hold in dependance on him and his title; *mediately* he gives me the purchaſe-money of this gift; *immediately* he gives me this part of the eſtate, and his title for my ſecurity, without which I ſhould poſſeſs precariouſly. It's a title *by purchaſe*, as to him that gave it me; it comes to me *by gift*, for I paid him nothing for it: Nor can I be ſaid to *pay the Seller*, though I have by gift *the title* for my ſecurity, which he that gave it me acquired by his payment; yet ſtill in dependance on him, who paid all, who hath the main of the eſtate, and is poſſeſſed of the original Covenants as in himſelf. This anſwers our caſe; excepting that God is as truly ſaid to give us all, as Chriſt himſelf can be ſaid to give us all; God having *given his own Son* to redeem us, and purchaſe all for us. I need not apply this Parallel more than to tell you, that as Chriſt acquired our Pardon and Acceptance, ſo we have *his very right thereto* to ſecure us. The whole is exemplified in that of the Apoſtle, *Chriſt was made Sin for us, who knew no Sin, that we might be made the Righteouſneſs of God in him.* Chriſt was *made Sin*, not eſteemed the committer of the fact, or as filthy by it; but he ſtood liable and *obliged* to the *puniſhment* of it, and became *the ſacrifice* for

SERM. II.

2 Cor. v. 21.

SERM. II. *for it*, which is often in Scripture called *Sin*. This obligation to bear the puniſhment is *reatus pœnæ*; or if you call it *reatus culpæ quoad pœnam*, it's much the ſame, though not ſo ſafe: Yet in this Chriſt is not charged, as if he committed the Sin. So we are *made the Righteouſneſs of God in him*, that is, We have given us *that right of Chriſt* to what was promiſed him for believers; and which was contrived and appointed by God to be the way of our ſalvation: The *debitum pœnæ* for our Sins became his, the *debitum præmii* for his Obedience becomes ours. But we no more *paid the purchaſe* of that right or title, than Chriſt did *commit the Sins*, the puniſhment whereof he obliged himſelf to undergo: He was *made Sin*, that is, *obliged to die a ſacrifice for Sin*; to which anſwers, that we are *made righteous in him*, that is, *inveſted in his Right*, for obtaining the bleſſings promiſed *to him* for us in the Covenant of Redemption, and promiſed *to us* for his ſake in the Goſpel-Covenant, when we believe.

HEREIN I have ſtated the firſt thing included in *Juſtification*, and upon this the reſt depend. Hereby we are *made righteous in Chriſt's righteouſneſs:* Though we be not perſonally innocent, yet Chriſt's righteouſneſs, which fully anſwered the Law, is judicially applied, ſo as to give us a ſure right to be dealt with as to eternity, as if we had been

been innocent and perfect; which is what we principally need, and as much as we are capable of, conſidering we are Sinners, and that we did not provide the ranſom, nor ſubſtitute him that became ſo. And now, SERM. II.

2. GOD hereupon *actually* forgives, adopts, and gives the earneſt of glory to believers, thus inveſted in the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and on the account of that righteouſneſs. This is *executive Juſtification* in part; and indeed all benefits peculiar to the members of Chriſt, are conferred in a way of execution hereof; unleſs as we may conſider ſuch Benefits, as *follow* Pardon and Adoption, to refer to Juſtification, as including an *additional Right* reſulting from God's pardoning and adopting acts. The reaſon why I add this, is, that Pardon gives a right to impunity, and Adoption gives a right to the privileges of children; and ſo with reſpect to Forgiveneſs and Adoption, a believer may be called *righteous*, and frequently in Scripture is called ſo, though incluſively of Chriſt's righteouſneſs, becauſe it is *for that* we are ſo forgiven and adopted. Forgiveneſs is of ſo great importance in Juſtification, that upon the account hereof we are ſaid to be *bleſſed*: Yea, it's put frequently for the whole of Juſtification; (*Rom.* iv. 6, 7, 8.) ſo it is uſed in the Lord's Prayer; (*Luk.* xi. 4.) yea, ſo it is put in our Creed.

3. GOD

SERM. II.

3. GOD *judicially ſentences* believers, thus made partakers of Chriſt's righteouſneſs, and thereupon pardoned and adopted, to be them who have *a right* to impunity, favour, and glory; and accepts them as ſuch, notwithſtanding all challenges and accuſations. *Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge of God's Elect? It is God that juſtifieth: Who is he that condemneth? It is Chriſt that died, yea rather, that is riſen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who alſo maketh interceſſion for us.* This doth not only obviate the accuſation of Perſecutors, againſt ſuch as are *choſen* to ſuffer; but it anſwers all Challenges againſt every believer, *gathered out of the world* by the Spirit, purſuant to God's eternal Election: For againſt the *unconverted* Elect, God himſelf hath much to charge; and he lays it to their charge by his Law-condemning Sentence. But as to the *converted*, here's a general defiance, and a large enumeration of what ends to their defence. God *juſtifies* them, and this for the ſake of Chriſt's *Death*; and that, the Death of him who is *riſen*, and being riſen is *enthroned*, and being enthroned intends their Security by his *Interceſſion*. It's true, if they be charged to *have been ſinners*, they muſt own it as a true Charge: But what then, muſt they *die* for their Sin? No; God declares they are pardoned, and this upon a Righteouſneſs more than adequate

Rom. viii. 33, 34.

to

to the Law of works; and they have no lower a ſafety from their guilt, than Chriſt's Title, who *died*, that believing Sinners *might not die*, but live. Indeed, if the Charge be, That theſe *are not believers*, then God acquits them another way, of which hereafter. This is *ſentential Juſtification*, which is *virtual* now, and will be ſolemnized at the great Day. Further, SERM. II.

4. IT is the Goſpel, whereby God juſtifies us as his *Inſtrument*; God in his Word having declared, that he is *the juſtifier of him that believes*, and that we are *juſtified by faith*, and commanding us to believe, with a Promiſe, that we ſhall be juſtified if we believe. He doth, by this very Declaration of his Will, juſtify the believer. This Promiſe effects what it includes, as ſoon as the *Object* is anſwerable to the tenor of the promiſe. By this he imputes Chriſt's righteouſneſs to the Convert, and ſo *makes him righteous*; declares him righteous, and treats him as righteous, in, for, and by Chriſt's righteouſneſs; and this, as ſoon as he believes. There needs no more to expreſs it now, than this Word of his Mouth; unleſs, as we may add, the Sacramental Seals, and alſo ſuch influences and acts of Power, whereby ſuch benefits are conferred, as are executive of the juſtifying Sentence; and ſo far are a Divine Declaration of our State as juſtified. And thus, Rom. iii. 26. Rom. v. 1.

5. THE *Object* of God's juſtifying Act, is

SERM. II. is the living, humbled, converted believer, who by Faith cometh to, accepteth of, and truſteth in Chriſt as an entire Saviour. The Promiſe of this mercy is *given to them that believe*; yea, is confined to ſuch; and unbelievers are declared to have *God's wrath abiding on them:* Nor can it be otherwiſe, when this Goſpel is that Word of the Lord whereby we are juſtified. 'Tis neceſſary then, that we *believe*; but it is not *Faith*, unleſs it be a coming to, accepting of, and truſting in a Chriſt; nor is it a Chriſt, if he be not a whole Saviour. But when *will we believe*, if we be not convinced and humbled? Or how *can we believe*, if we be not quickned by the Spirit? Yea, what ſort of *Faith* is it, if we are not purpoſed in our heart to *turn* from all Sins, Self, and Idols to Chriſt, and to God by him? Which *turning* is the word, by which the Spirit oft expreſſeth Faith itſelf, *Ezek.* xviii. 21, 30. *Acts* xxvi. 18. 1 *Pet.* ii. 25.

Gal. iii. 22.

John iii. 36.

BY what has been ſaid, you may anſwer the main Enquiries, that occur to your mind concerning Juſtification: *Qu.* Who juſtifies us? *Anſ.* God as our Ruler. *Qu.* What doth God do for us, or on us, when he juſtifies? *Anſ.* (1.) He imputes Chriſt's righteouſneſs to us, whereby we have his Right to our pardon, abſolution, *&c.* (2.) He actually forgives, abſolves, and adopts us in Chriſt's Right, and for the ſake of his obedience. And by this forgiveneſs, abſolution

lution and adoption, he further gives us a Right to impunity, the in-dwelling Spirit, perſeverance, and eternal glory. And, (3.) He pronounces us free from all accuſation and challenges, that would import a preſent liableneſs to eternal Death, or a bar to eternal Glory; we having Chriſt's righteouſneſs, and thereby our pardon, our abſolution from the curſe, and our adoption, for our Plea and Defence. *Qu.* What is our State by being thus juſtified? *Anſ.* We are accepted with God, free from eternal Condemnation, and entitled to Life, as if we had not ſinned, but kept the whole Law to this time: Yea, we have ſome greater benefits than we forfeited, as union with Chriſt, the in-dwelling Spirit, and perſeverance, whereby we are ſecured from forfeiting eternal Life for the future. *Qu.* By what Inſtrument, or ſign of his Will, doth God juſtify us? *Anſ.* By the Goſpel-promiſe. *Qu.* Whom doth God juſtify? *Anſ.* The true Believer, (whether he know himſelf to be ſo, or no,) and no others: Yea, God in juſtifying a man, doth as far *declare* him to be a believer, as he declares him to be juſtified. *Qu.* When doth God juſtify a Sinner? *Anſ.* As ſoon as he is a Believer, and not before; ſuch being the Object on whom the juſtifying act doth terminate, according to the Promiſe.

SERM. II.

1 *Exh.* SEE that your Faith be true, and then may you rejoice in a juſtified

SERM. II. State. A *falſe Faith* will leave you condemned, as certainly as if you had no Faith: And a falſe Faith too many have been ſatisfied with. *Simon believed*, but yet *had neither part nor lot in this matter*; becauſe *his Heart was not right with God*, and he was *in the gall of bitterneſs, and in the bond of iniquity*. Be then ſolicitous, that your Faith be right; ſee that it be unfeigned and true; true for its *principle*, even from regeneration; true for its *nature*, a fiducial conſent, or ſuch a truſt in Chriſt, and in God by him, as to receive a whole Chriſt; true for its *concomitants*, that no ſaving Grace be wanting; true for its *operativeneſs* and *effects*, that it works by Love, purifies the heart, and makes you perſevere in ſincere obedience, and holy fruits. All this is neceſſary to the *Faith* the Goſpel calls *ſaving*; ſince God will judge your Faith, and you, by it.

Acts viii. 13, 21, 23.

2 *Exh.* BE not ſatisfied merely with believing, or talking, that there is a full righteouſneſs in Chriſt; but *ſubmit* to God's way of imputing it; elſe you will be no better nor ſafer by it. Thouſands are damned as unrighteous, tho' Chriſt hath a full righteouſneſs. It is not from a defect in Chriſt's righteouſneſs; no, nor becauſe God fails to impute it to ſuch, whom he hath promiſed it to: Whence then? It is becauſe they do not ſavingly believe, and turn to Chriſt. The Goſpel is God's Will,

Will, as to the way of the application of Christ's righteouſneſs; and if that be not *obeyed*, we are loſt. (2 *Theſſ.* i. 8. *Gal.* iii. 1. *Heb.* v. 9.) Unbelief, is *diſobedience* to the Goſpel, and will deſtroy: ἀπειθεια, which is diſobedience, is oft render'd *unbelief*; (Rom. xi. 30, 32. Heb. iv. 11.) and ἀπειθησαντες, *unbelieving*; (Acts xiv. 2. and xvii. 5.) and ἀπειθειν, *not to believe*. Heb. iii. 18. The work of the Miniſtry is to call and perſuade ſinners to comply with the Goſpel, with an aſſurance, that ſuch as refuſe not, ſhall be juſtified by Chriſt; and they who perſiſt to refuſe, ſhall periſh, notwithſtanding the grace of God, and the righteouſneſs of Chriſt. *Mat.* xxiii. 37. *Acts* xiii. 38, 46.

SERM. II.

HAVING thus inſiſted on this Propoſition, I am led thereby to this Queſtion:

Queſt. *Are Believers as righteous as Chriſt in equality?* Or, *Are they equally righteous as Chriſt?*

Anſw. BELIEVERS are *not equally righteous* as Chriſt. Sincere Chriſtians are in ſome reſpect as *truly* righteous as Chriſt; but yet that is not to be *equally* righteous as Chriſt. Hence many chuſe to ſay, we are as righteous as Chriſt *æquè*, but not *æqualiter*. Yea, though one aſſert an Identity in the righteouſneſs, yet that will not argue an Equality. It's one thing, to have the *ſame* righteouſneſs; it's another thing,

SERM. II. to have it in the *ſame meaſure.* The Light in the air is the ſame as in the Sun; but yet it is in a greater degree in the Sun than in the air. But you will ſay,

Obj. *We are equally righteous as Chriſt, with reſpect to his Suretiſhip righteouſneſs.*

Anſw. I SHALL, *Firſt*, Give you my thoughts concerning Chriſt's *Suretiſhip.* And then, *Secondly*, Prove that we cannot on this account, nor any other, be truly ſaid to be as righteous as Chriſt in equality. As to the

Firſt Point, CONCERNING Chriſt's *Suretiſhip*; I would premiſe, That this term *Suretiſhip righteouſneſs*, is no Scripture expreſſion, no more, nor ſo much as the word *Condition.* I ſay, not ſo much; for if you conſider *Luke* xiv. 26, 27, 32, 33. you'll find *Condition* uſed exactly in the ſenſe objected againſt by ſome: *Ver.* 32, 33. *Or elſe, while the other is yet a great way off, he ſendeth an ambaſſage, and deſireth* conditions *of peace: So likewiſe, whoſoever he be of you, that forſaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my Diſciple:* And *ver.* 26, 27. *If any man come to me, and hate not his Father and Mother, &c. yea and his own Life alſo, he cannot be my Diſciple: And whoſoever doth not bear his Croſs, and come after me, cannot be my Diſciple.* Our bleſſed Lord doth in theſe verſes propoſe what is neceſſary to Chriſtian Diſcipleſhip, without which we cannot be ſaved. He pitches on ſuch

ſuch things as were hardeſt to the fleſh, as what his very Followers muſt be judged by; to inforce and improve which, he delivers two Parables. By the firſt Parable he adviſeth men to conſider well the terms or conditions of Chriſtianity, before they engage in the profeſſion of it, leſt they be aſhamed; *ver.* 28, 29, 30. By the ſecond he confirms the firſt, and adds, how neceſſary it is to conſent to theſe conditions, as hard as they be; for we are in a ſtate of Enmity, and *fooliſhly* perſiſt therein, ſince we are unable to defend ourſelves againſt God, when his vengeance approacheth; and therefore 'tis our wiſdom *in the time of his long-ſuffering*, to ſubmit to the conditions of peace. This is further applied in the next words: *So likewiſe, whoſoever he be of you*, &c. How is this redditive [*ſo*] properly uſed, or the Parables applied, if taking up our Croſs, following Chriſt, hating Father and Mother, and perſevering, are not *conditions* of our true Diſcipleſhip, and conſequently of ſalvation by Chriſt? unleſs we may be at peace, and be ſaved, without being Chriſt's Diſciples. But what need I digreſs, when the *Aſſembly*, and all valuable Divines, uſe the word in our ſenſe? Yea, the Goſpel ſo oft ſpeaks conditionally; *If thou confeſs*, &c. I return to what I affirmed, *viz.* That *Suretiſhip righteouſneſs* is no Scripture expreſſion. *Surety* I know is once uſed, and but once as

SERM. II.

Luke xix. 42.

Rom. x. 9.

SERM. II. to Chriſt; the word *righteouſneſs* is oft uſed; but *Suretiſhip righteouſneſs* is a new word, of human original, and I am ſure, not conſonant to Scripture-ſenſe, as it's uſed to infer an *equality of righteouſneſs* between Chriſt and us.

HAVING premiſed this, I will now ſhew you, [1.] What I grant concerning Chriſt's *Suretiſhip*; and, [2.] What I deny, according to plain Scripture.

[1.] THE things that I *grant* are theſe:

Heb. vii. 22. 1. CHRIST is the *Surety* of the Goſpel-Covenant, for all his actual Seed; yea, for the Elect, as far as it includes the promiſe of the firſt Grace. He is engaged, on the part of his people, that they ſhall grow in grace, ſhall perſevere, and keep covenant with God, and not turn away finally or totally from him: He doth not bind *himſelf*, to grow in grace for us, or to perſevere in performing the conditions of this Covenant for us; but that *we* ſhall do it. Yea, he is *Surety*, to ſee the ends of the Covenant purſued, as to God's part, that he will forgive us, be our God, *&c.* Not that God's Truth or Ability need a Surety: But the weakneſs of our Faith is anſwer'd by ſuch a ſupport; for which end God *ſweareth*, and appointeth *Covenant-Seals*: So doth he condeſcend to our infirmity!

2. CHRIST hath undertaken in the Covenant of Redemption, that he would make Satisfaction to Juſtice for us, and obey the whole

whole Will of God; that he would actually bring into the Goſpel-covenant all the Elect, by cauſing them to believe; and that he would bring each of the Elect to eternal Glory in a way of Faith and Holineſs; of which before. But you muſt not hence infer, that Chriſt engaged to repent for us, or to believe in himſelf for us; which to do, would ſuppoſe him a Sinner, and to need a Mediator. He was a real *Sponſor*, engaging to do all that belonged to him. SERM. II.

3. CHRIST accordingly died in our nature, and that not only for our good, but in our ſtead; *noſtro loco*. We were liable to die, but he ſtept in and *died*, that we might not die; who otherwiſe muſt have died, but now live by his dying for us. He was a proper ἀντίψυχος, he gave his Life for ours; yea, and this to vindicate the glory of God in exempting us from death. He alſo *obeyed* for us; not indeed to exempt us from obeying, (for by it we are brought to obey, inſtead of rebelling,) nor only to be a holy offering and example; but that the want of our perfect obedience might not exclude us from acceptance and heaven; and that by his obedience and ſufferings, he might acquire for all his members a Title to happineſs, in his right, and not to be merited by any work or obedience of their own. That the Lord Jeſus did ſuffer properly *in our ſtead*, is plain from what the

SERM. II.

Mat. xx. 28. 1 Tim. ii. 6.

Scripture says, that he came *to give his life* λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, *a ransom for*, or instead of *many*; and again, that he *gave himself* ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, *a ransom for*, or in the room of *all*. He was typified in the Sacrifices, whose lives were given up *instead of* theirs, for whom they were offered; and he is oft called *a Sacrifice*. Neither is it to be doubted, but he actively obeyed *in our stead*, in the sense above given; yea, and hath excluded also the necessity and place of our obedience for the *Impetration* of any saving benefits. Thus far the Word of God directs us to call Christ, either *Surety*, *Sponsor*, *Representative*, &c. But,

[2.] THE thing that I *deny* is, That Christ by his obedience made atonement or merited for us, as a proper *pecuniary Surety* in the Law of works. The thing is far otherwise; for Christ suffered and obeyed as a *Principal* and sole undertaker, and not as a *Surety*, that supposed us Principals in that undertaking. He bound himself to God, to give his life, by dying *in our stead*, to save ours; but he never was bound in one Bond with us, that he *should do so*. I shall give you a few Reasons of many.

1 *R.* GOD never *proposed* it to fallen Sinners, to make atonement for their Sins, and by Merit to recover the eternal Life, which they had forfeited. Where is the Law or Covenant, whereby God proposed this

this to Sinners, as their Duty, and a way for their recovery? By the Law of works it was impossible, and a contradiction: And the Gospel condemns all thought of it, as contrary to the whole scope of it. The compact between the Father and Son was not a Law or Covenant proposed to Sinners, for their performance of the conditions thereof. Now *a Money-Surety* is bound to no more, than the Principal is bound to do. If I am not obliged to pay a hundred pounds, neither is my Surety bound to pay a hundred pounds. But you will say, SERM. II.

Obj. *By the Law, we were bound to obey the Law perfectly, or to die for it.* *Ans.* Yes: To obey was your Duty, and to die was the Penalty if you disobey'd. But, (1.) You were not bound to die, though you obeyed perfectly: But Christ was bound to obey, and to suffer though he obey'd. (2.) Nor were you bound, when you did sin, and suffer the Penalty, to obey afresh in a way of meriting forfeited blessings: But Christ suffered, and yet obey'd to merit forfeited blessings, and more. (3.) Nor were you bound to suffer as your *Duty*, and that in a way of Propitiation, to reconcile the offended God by it as an act of obedience; Yet Christ engaged in this manner: (4.) Nor were you bound by the Law, that the Son of God should assume your flesh, and therein obey

and

SERM. II. and suffer: Yet thereupon depends the Satisfaction and Merit of the obedience yielded; thence is the Value, of the acts done and sufferings endured. It were not a Payment without that; for dying and obeying too, would not serve to save Sinners, if it were not the Son of God in our nature did both: *This goes into the Price and Payment.* Could men have done it, it had been no Payment, supposing but one Sin before. So that in this very respect, Christ was bound to redeem you, by paying a *Million* in the value of his Person; and the same Actions and Passion as done and suffered by you, would not have been *one Penny* in value. And is he properly but *your pecuniary Surety*, when he is bound for a Million, and you not for a Penny, as in *Redemption-work?* Yea further, (5.) You are supposed fallen, and the Covenant of Works broken, ere Christ undertakes to pay any thing. And can the Bond be the same, when the Parties are changed, and the Conditions so changed on both parts, as to the Creditor and Debtors too; the former granting other things, the latter paying greater things; the first in the rewards, the latter in the duties? Is it the same Bond, and you *Principals*, when transacted without your privity, your consent not given, the terms not exacted from you, and (unless to reproach you,) not possible to be *proposed* to you? God knew himself

himself and you too well, to propose to you, "If you will make your souls an "offering for sin, and perfectly keep my "Law, I will then receive you again into "favour:" Yet this would change the Bond. Or if you would be thought *Principals* in the Covenant of Redemption, it must thus be proposed to you; "If you "will procure and send the Son of God, "to take your flesh and die, and to obey "the Law for you, then I will be recon-"ciled to you:" Had he been thus in your disposal, and he had done it at your disposal, you might claim at the rate as some do. But though God gave his Son, and his Son gave himself to redeem you, yet *you* never gave him; no, nor were engaged to give him, as the Condition of your recovery. SERM. II.

THESE, and many other Considerations, should lead us to conclude, that *Redemption-work* was proposed only to Christ in the Covenant of Redemption, and that he was *Principal* and sole undertaker, as well as the sole Performer, *and of the People there was none with him.* He alone undertook to satisfy Justice, that we might be redeemed; he alone engaged for the whole Impetration work, and to find the Merit of our happiness. And though part of his Obedience was that, which we were obliged to do, (yet not for Redemption at all;) nevertheless his Obligation to do it was not Isa. lxiii. 3.

as

SERM. II. as our *Money-Surety*; but by a voluntary Sponſion he entred into a Bond, that depended not upon our conſent or performance, and by which we have no claim, but at his and the Father's pleaſure. It was *us* he was to buy, but it was *he* alone ſtood obliged to pay: He engaged *to die for us*, but that is not engaging *for us as Principals*, that he would die; a thing, which we never were obliged to. He did not engage, we ſhould not ſin; nor if we ſinned, that we ſhould make ſatisfaction: But he engaged, that *he* would ſatisfy God, that we might not die for our Sins; even *one Chriſt* for all of us, and *once to die* inſtead of our eternal Death.

2 *R.* WERE Chriſt a proper *pecuniary Surety* in his death and obedience, there would be no room for God's forgiving us any Sin, or giving us any Mercy *as of free gift*, unleſs he forgave us more than Chriſt ſatisfied for, or beſtowed what he did not merit. This is evident: For if my Surety be bound with me to a Creditor for a thouſand pounds; if my Surety pay, as my Surety, this thouſand pounds, the Creditor *forgives me* nothing, but I pay him all. So as to Merit: If I buy a Jewel for an hundred pounds, and give Bond for it, with a Surety bound with me for that Sum; if my Surety ſhall pay that hundred pounds, can the Seller be ſaid to *give me* that Jewel? No; I in a Law-ſenſe paid him,

him, becauſe my Surety did it. Whereas the Goſpel lays the Streſs of our felicity upon Forgiveneſs: *Rom.* iv. 7. *Acts* xiii. 38. And though Juſtice do not ſuffer, as having received glory by Chriſt, yet that is not to *exclude* Forgiveneſs, but to *make way* for Forgiveneſs in a conſiſtency with his perfections. And further, God no more *ſells us* any bleſſing, notwithſtanding Chriſt's Merits, than Chriſt ſells them to us: Whereas he muſt ſell all benefits, and forgive no faults, if he be conſidered as a Creditor, and Chriſt as our Money-Surety. But you will ſay, SERM. II.

Obj. *God may be ſaid to forgive us, being he* admitted Chriſt *to be a pecuniary Surety, tho' we pay by him.* *Anſ.* That goes a very little way towards Forgiveneſs; yea, and to refuſe it in Money-matters, is hardly admitable by the rules of equity. It ſounds low, to hear a Creditor ſay, "You were bound "to me for a thouſand pounds, which I "was paid by one that I allowed to be "your Surety; and becauſe I would take "it from you *by him*, I forgave it you, "though I got from you legally by your "Surety every Farthing of your Debt." This is not *forgiving*; and the admitting ſuch a Change, whilſt the very debt in kind is paid, is not an abatement. Yet ſtill,

Obj. *God* procured Chriſt *to be our Surety, and therefore he forgave us.* *Anſ.* In diſcharging a Debt, this will not amount

SERM. II. amount to Forgiveneſs. If one owes me ten pounds, for which I caſt him into priſon; on finding him inſolvent, do I forgive him, if I get one that wiſheth him well to pay it for him? I befriend him indeed, but am paid all my ſelf, even by him in his Surety, without any forgiving. I know nothing more ſuſpicious to be an Error, than what tends to overturn the doctrine of the Forgiveneſs of Sins, which is the great ſupport of a poor Sinner; and with this the notion of ſtrict *Money-Suretiſhip*, whereby we paid all to God, is chargeable: Whereas if you conſider God as Ruler, and Chriſt as Mediator, making ſatisfaction for criminals by enduring puniſhment in their ſtead, we avoid all the difficulties which that of *Money-debts* perplex the work of Redemption with. The *Socinians* main ſtrength lies in Objections, from Sin being as a Money-debt, and Chriſt's Death being the payment of a debt, even the *Idem*. This is perceived, and therefore denied by our beſt Authors againſt the *Socinians*, as *Lubbertus*, *Eſſenius*, *Turretin*, *Owen*, *Stillingfleet*, &c.

3 *R.* WERE Chriſt a proper *pecuniary Surety* in the ſame Law of works with them, then every Believer would be entitled to the *ſame Reward* as Chriſt is entitled to; yea, and as much, or more than Chriſt. This is evident: For if I covenant with another,

another, that in conſideration of my pay- SERM.
ing a thouſand pounds, I ſhall enjoy ſuch II.
an eſtate of fifty pounds a year; if I have
a Surety engaged with me for the payment
of that money, and by my Surety I pay
the thouſand pounds; upon this I have the
legal right to that eſtate, rather than my
Surety; and at moſt my Surety can have
a right to no more, than that fifty pounds
a year in common with me by thoſe co-
venants: Or if there be other covenants
between me and him, wherein I engage to
repay him that or more, in thoſe covenants
he is not my Surety, but a diſtinct party.
Hence it follows, that we are entitled to
be *exalted over all*, and have *a name above
every name*, to *ſee our Seed*, to be regard-
ed as *ſaviours*, or at leaſt to be ſatisfiers to
God for ourſelves, and our own Redeem-
ers in a Law-ſenſe. And if it be ſaid,

Obj. *Chriſt paid all* perſonally, *and not we,
and therefore he hath peculiar Rewards and
Honour.* *Anſ.* The Principal and Surety is
one legal Perſon, and therefore, if the Law
reckon that we ſatisfied in Chriſt, the Re-
ward promiſed on that ſatisfaction is com-
mon to us with Chriſt. The Law gives
the honour as it receives the tribute, and
diſtributes the recompence as it eſtimates
the obedience: And if *one Perſon in Law*,
made up of us and Chriſt, alike obeyed in
a Law-ſenſe; then *one Perſon in Law*,
made up of him and us, muſt be alike re-
warded;

SERM. II. warded; and as we are reckoned to do all, ſo we are adjudged to have a Right to all that is due upon that doing. I ſhall ſay more of this preſently.

4 *R.* IF Chriſt be a ſtrict *pecuniary Surety*, I think it will be impoſſible to confute many very erroneous Opinions, which naturally are deduced therefrom. What can be ſaid againſt our being *juſtified* actually *before we believe?* For if we ſatisfied the Law in Chriſt, how can our Juſtification be ſuſpended till we believe, unleſs there be ſome other Law? The Law acquits us, as ſoon as the condition is performed by us. And if you ſay,

Obj. *We do not apply Chriſt to ourſelves before Faith.* *Anſ.* (1.) God, by the Law, applies him to us, if we have ſatisfied it; and he hath applied him already, in making him our Money-Surety; for the Law will execute itſelf, whether we apply or no. (2.) When the conditions are performed by us, it's againſt the Law to deny us the Reward; or at leaſt to continue us under its Curſe a moment; yea, or to enjoin any terms on us for poſſeſſing the Reward, beſides its own conditions, which are fulfilled by us: For after this, the laying of guilt on our perſons at any time is unjuſt. Or ſhould it be ſaid,

Obj. *We are not Chriſt's Seed, till we believe.* *Anſ.* All will not own that: But if we ever ſatisfy in Chriſt, it muſt be when he ſatisfied;

fied; it is not to be done now, when the Act of performing the atonement, and paying the debt, is over. Can we, by becoming his Seed now, be eſteemed to pay what he paid ſo many years ſince, if we did not pay it then? Or can he be our *Money-Surety*, by whom we pay now when he hath done paying, and not then when he was paying? But, SERM. II.

Obj. *He being given by God to be our Surety, and not appointed by us to die, God may ſuſpend giving us the benefits of his death, until we believe.* *Anſ.* If God made him a ſtrict *Money-Surety* with us in the Law of Innocence, he either did change the Law, or precluded himſelf from a Right of ſuſpending the benefits, (at leaſt the reſtoration of his Image, and Freedom from the reign of Sin, the curſe and wrath of God,) till we believe: For the Law is *changed*, if it ſay, "Thou ſhalt "be free from the dominion of Sin, and "the guilt thereof, but not till thou be-"lieve in Chriſt, though thou haſt already "legally performed all the legal condi-"tions:" But if it be not changed, it immediately entitles to the Reward, and muſt be violated, if at leaſt any Puniſhment lie upon the perfect performer of the conditions; for it's a puniſhing us after the debt is legally paid by us. Now though there is hardly a Truth more plain in the word of God, than that *the Wrath of God abides ſtill upon all unbelievers, notwithſtanding*

SERM. II.

Chriſt's Death; yet you ſee, how this notion of *Money-Suretiſhip* ſhakes it. I might give other Inſtances; as, that we ought not to confeſs our Sins, nor pray for forgiveneſs; that God afflicts only from Sin, but not *for Sin* at all; that God will judge and juſtify us only by the Law of works, and we are ſaved by that Law; that if God charge us with Sin, we may charge him with unrighteouſneſs; that *David* was as acceptable to God, whilſt he murthered *Uriah*, as when he obeyed God moſt; that God requires nothing from us, to eſcape his wrath and curſe for Sin; and that we muſt not propoſe any benefit to ourſelves by any Duty, or acting of Grace, nor are we a jot the better by them. Theſe, and the like, ſpring from this very Opinion, "That we ſatisfied the Law fully, and "perfectly obeyed it in Chriſt, as a *pecu-* "*niary Surety* with us in that Law;" to ſay nothing of the advantage the *Socinians* have thereby. Theſe may caution us in our conceptions, eſpecially when the conſidering of Chriſt as a *pecuniary Surety* of the Law of works, paying debts to a Creditor, is not neceſſary to any one Goſpel-end; neither the glory of Chriſt, the government of God, the ſalvation of the Elect, the ſpiritual comfort of Believers, or the promoting of Holineſs: All which are more clearly ſubſerved by this word, *a Surety of the new Covenant*, joined with other

other words frequently uſed by the Holy Ghoſt, as *Mediator*, *Redeemer*, *Saviour*, *Ranſomer*, and the whole œconomy of Redemption plainly ſtated thereby. SERM. II.

5 *R.* CHRIST's being a ſtrict *Money-Surety*, would be a very great loſs to us. If he be our Surety in the Covenant of works, then we can have no claim to any benefit but what the Covenant of works promiſeth; whereby we ſhall loſe Union with Chriſt, the in-dwelling Spirit, and whatever degree of Glory is to be expected by Chriſt, above what *Adam* was to enjoy in caſe he had not fallen; of which I have ſpoken before. The reaſon is, If I have a Surety in a Bond, wherein I have certain immunities upon paying a ſum of money, if my Surety pay that money, I can thereby have a right to no more immunities than that Bond contains.

6 *R.* CHRIST, where he is called a Surety, was the *Surety of a better Teſtament*; and therefore not of the Law of works, which enjoined obedience, and inflicted death on ſinners. The word διαθηκη is ſometimes rendered *Teſtament*, ſometimes *Covenant*; and well it might be rendered *a legal Diſpoſition*: But call it which you will, this Teſtament or Covenant of which Chriſt is Surety here, cannot be the Covenant of works. It was not the Covenant that obliged us to die for Sin, or perfectly to obey in a way of merit, of which he is Heb. vii. 22.

SERM. II. ſaid to be the Surety here. Is the Law of works that *better Covenant* or Teſtament? Or muſt Chriſt be a Surety for us in the Covenant of works, becauſe he is the Surety of a *better Covenant*, which is not the Covenant of works?

IF you doubt whether this *better Covenant* be not the Covenant of works, conſider the whole Context. This *better Covenant* is oppoſed to the *Jewiſh Covenant*, as the Prieſthood of Chriſt is oppoſed to the *Levitical* Prieſthood; which Prieſthood of Chriſt the Apoſtle proves to be higher and better than the *Levitical*, by many arguments: As in particular, Chriſt was a Prieſt *after the Order of Melchiſedec*, who was greater than *Abraham* or *Levi*: He ſucceeded the *Levitical* Prieſthood, as it was *unable* to attain the great ends of Prieſthood: His Prieſthood is *unchangeable*, becauſe he *ever lives*, and thoſe Prieſts were mortal: Chriſt was made Prieſt *with an Oath*, they *without an Oath*: And to add no more, Chriſt *was made Surety of a better Teſtament*; which is again expreſſed by ſaying, *He is the Mediator of a better Covenant*, or Teſtament; and then it follows, *If the firſt Covenant had been faultleſs, there had been no place for a ſecond.* Now it is manifeſt, the *better Covenant*, or *Teſtament*, muſt be the ſame in both theſe places; and the word in the original is the ſame in both. And you have here a full account, what this *better Covenant* is: It's the *new Covenant*,

Heb. viii. 6, 7.

nant, wherein *forgiveneſs of ſin*, among other bleſſings, is promiſed: At moſt, it's the *Covenant of Grace* as in the laſt edition; of which Covenant, but on different accounts, Chriſt is called the *Mediator*, the *Surety*, the *Teſtator*. And the *betterneſs* of this edition of the Covenant, is founded on the betterneſs of Chriſt's *Prieſthood*; who purchaſed it with all its benefits by his Blood, confirmed it by his Death, and by his *Interceſſion* ſecures the great ends of it. So that, *By how much* he had a better Prieſthood, *By ſo much* he *was made a Surety of a better Teſtament*: Or, as the Apoſtle afterwards expreſſeth it, *He hath obtained a more excellent Miniſtry, by how much alſo he is the Mediator of a better Covenant, which was eſtabliſhed upon better Promiſes.* And was this now the Covenant of works? Surely no: For the Law of works pronounced the *curſe*, this the *bleſſing*: The Law of works bindeth *guilt*; this aſſures us, that *God will be merciful to our unrighteouſneſs, and our ſins and iniquities he'll remember no more*: The Law of works is a killing Letter; but by this Covenant, of which Chriſt is Surety, God *writes his Law in our hearts, and is to us a God, and we to him a People.* Yea, Perſeverance alſo is ſecured; for the Lord Jeſus being Surety of this bleſſed and better Covenant, will ſee it kept by all the parties; he undertakes to have its ends accompliſhed, and to ſecure its being fulfilled. Be-

SERM. II.

Heb. viii. 8, & *ſeq.*

Heb. vii. 22.

Heb. viii. 6.

SERM. II.

lievers then ſhall perſevere; and New Teſtament Saints ſhall generally have freer acceſs to God, ſhall fear and know God more, and be holier, than Old Teſtament Saints. Yea, all the Elect ſhall be brought into this Covenant, and be ſaved by it.

As *Mediator* of this Covenant, Chriſt *died for the redemption of tranſgreſſions*, even of thoſe *under the firſt Teſtament*, viz. before his Incarnation; which were pardoned on the proſpect of it: And by his Death he purchaſed, that *they which are called might receive the Promiſe of eternal inheritance.* As *Teſtator*, he bequeaths, and diſpoſes by and according to this Goſpel-Teſtament, what he acquired by his obedience, even to a bloody death; and by that *death* this Teſtamentary diſpoſition is *irrevocable.* As *Surety*, he undertakes, that his Teſtament (which is alſo God's Covenant with us,) ſhall be fulfilled, even on our parts, as well as on the part of God to us. And this the Apoſtle directly applies to Chriſt's *ever living and interceding*, as what fitted him for it, and whereby he executes this Suretiſhip: *Wherefore he is able alſo to ſave them to the uttermoſt, that come unto God by him, ſeeing he ever liveth to make interceſſion for them.* Many Teſtaments are unfulfilled, becauſe the Teſtator, being dead, cannot ſee to the execution of them, and ſo the Legatees are wronged: But Chriſt *ever lives*, and attends to the fulfilling his Teſtament,

Heb. ix. 15.

Heb. vii. 25.

ment, which is the ſame with God's Cove- SERM.
nant; with reſpect to which as God's Cove- II.
nant, he ſtill *intercedes*, as well as ever lives:
Accordingly you'll find, that this Apoſtle
lodges the height of the ſecurity of Chriſti-
ans, againſt and from condemnation, upon
this *Interceſſion* of Chriſt; *Who is he that* Rom. viii.
condemneth? it is Chriſt that died, yea ra- 34.
ther, that is riſen again, who is even at the
right hand of God; who alſo maketh Inter-
ceſſion for us. He aſcribes our Safety to
his *living* and *interceding*, rather and more
than to his mere *dying*; for though *by his*
death he acquired and bequeathed abſolu-
tion, *&c.* for his Seed; yet it's *by his living*
again, and *interceding*, he ſecures, and ſees
his Seed poſſeſſed of that abſolution, and
all other bleſſings. And if we conſider,
that this Covenant mentioneth here, rather
benefits promiſed to his Seed, than condi-
tions of any benefits as required either of
him or his Seed; he ſeems to be pointed at
here more directly as *a Surety* to ſee God's
Promiſes made good to his Seed, than to
ſecure that the Engagements they are under
by the New Covenant ſhall be made good
by his Seed; though it's a great truth, He
is *a Surety on our part*, that we ſhall keep
Covenant, or we ſhould ſoon undo our
ſelves.

I THINK then, it is paſt contradiction,
That the *Covenant* Chriſt is Surety of in
this place, (which is the only place where

SERM. II.

he is called a Surety,) is the *Goſpel-Covenant*: And if ſo, he can, even as a *Money-Surety*, hereby be bound with us to no more, than what we are engaged to do and ſuffer by this Goſpel-Covenant. It is true, by the *Covenant of Redemption*, he was engaged to ſuffer death in the human nature for Satisfaction, and this in our place; and alſo to obey the whole Law; and both, for the Salvation of his Seed: But in that Covenant he was Principal; for God never obliged us to Redemption-work, either by ourſelves, or by any other; and therefore Chriſt herein is what the *Civilians* call *Expromiſſor*: He is obliged alone, though he acts for another. But how ſtrange is it, that from Chriſt's being a *Surety* of the *New Covenant* or Teſtament, men ſhould conclude, that Chriſt is a *Money-Surety* of the Covenant of works; and as ſuch, paid all our Old Covenant debts, as debts; and that altogether in Kind, and ſo as we are accounted to pay that debt, and to merit Life by that very Covenant? yea, and ſhould go ſo far, as to damn all that will not ſay as they ſay; though to ſay ſo, makes either Chriſt's obedience, or his ſufferings, needleſs, all Forgiveneſs impoſſible, all Goſpel-terms of application of Chriſt's Merits unjuſt; a ſuſpenſion of a Right to thoſe benefits for any time, injurious; a Right in men to equal rewards with Chriſt, inviolable; all

remains

remains of Diſpleaſure on the unconverted Elect, and the Reign of Sin in them, matter of juſt complaint againſt God; and a Claim to any greater bleſſings than the Law of works promiſed, impoſſible. SERM. II.

I MIGHT further argue this Point by other conſiderations: As, that it's inconſiſtent with Chriſt's being a Mediator, he being a Party; and alſo with Chriſt's being a proper Redeemer of Sinners, any more than of himſelf: Yea, it excludes the true Goſpel Imputation of Chriſt's righteouſneſs in our Juſtification upon believing; as there's no Righteouſneſs of Chriſt that we have given us; ſince it was legally *in us* as much as *in him*, we having legally performed the conditions as much as he; and ſo we need not look out of our ſelves for Righteouſneſs, for though our Surety did the acts from whence that Righteouſneſs reſulted, yet the Law-Right was in us as well as in him; with many other.

ALL I aim at by inſiſting on this Point, is to guide your thoughts to true apprehenſions of the Doctrine of Satisfaction, and to ſecure you againſt the vulgar miſtakes and dangerous notions that are gathered from the abuſive ſtraining of the word *Surety*. Whereas, if you conſider God as *Rector*, Sinners as *Criminals*, and Sin as a *Crime*, making Sinners liable to the curſe according to the Law; which Law muſt be honoured in the ſatisfaction of Juſtice,

and

SERM. II. and vindication of the Divine Government: And the Lord Jesus, on the Law-giver's proposing it, freely undertaking, and promising in the Covenant of Redemption, to submit to the obligation of bearing the punishment due to, and in the Stead of those Sinners; this punishment being to be endured in the human nature, and being of equal Weight, yea, and in many things, of the same Kind, with what they were to endure: And the Law-giver promising to Christ, for his enduring this Punishment and perfectly obeying his Will, that a great and certain Number should certainly believe in him; and that all believing in him, should in his Righteousness be pardoned, adopted, sanctified, and eternally saved, in a way of Faith and persevering Holiness, to his Glory; and that Sinners should have an Offer of these benefits on the Terms of the Gospel-Covenant, and the benefits be assuredly dispensed in that Gospel-way, *&c.* I say, In this manner every thing is consistent; and with these limitations, the terms *Sponsor*, *Mediator*, *Surety*, and *Redeemer*, are proper and consistent. I proceed now to the

Second Point, To prove that we are *not equally righteous* as Christ; and here I shall have occasion to shew, we are not so as to his *Suretiship righteousness*.

[1.] WE are not *equally holy* as Christ; as this is a conformity to the Divine Image and

and Will, and is called *righteouſneſs*. Have we an habitual Holineſs, in a meaſure comparable to his? Or can we pretend to that Purity of heart and life, or that exalted Obedience to the Will of God which he rendered? Our hearts muſt condemn ſuch a thought; nay, Angels dare not be rivals with him therein; much leſs can *we*, *vile Creatures*, whoſe defects are ſo manifeſt, and whoſe defilements are ſo many. He is propoſed as *our Example*; but in what is it we can imitate him in Equality? SERM. II. Job xl. 4. Mat. xi. 29.

[2.] It is not true, that we *performed the conditions* of redemption and life equally with Chriſt. I ſuppoſe, they mean this by *Suretiſhip righteouſneſs*, who chuſe that word. They think, that becauſe a Principal may be ſaid in Law to pay to the Creditor the very ſame Money as the Surety pays, and is conſidered in Law to have paid it equally with the Surety; therefore all Sinners for whom Chriſt died and obeyed, did then equally die and obey as Chriſt himſelf: Or as others would have it, that when they *believe*, God doth account, that they died and obeyed equally with Chriſt, and they have fully anſwered in a Law-ſenſe the Law of works; ſo that they are juſtified by that very Law, being truly and legally innocent by the Satisfaction they have made, and the Obedience they have yielded as one legal perſon with

SERM. II. with Chriſt: And ſo they are *righteous as Chriſt*, not barely in Similitude, but in Equality.

BUT though I grant, that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, for which we are juſtified, be a righteouſneſs adequate to the Law, yea, *ſupra-legal*, as well as in ſubſtance truly legal; yet I deny that to be a *Suretiſhip righteouſneſs*, in a ſenſe that can infer us *equally righteous* as Chriſt. For,

1 *R.* I HAVE fully proved, that Chriſt was not *a Money-Surety* with Sinners or Believers in the Law of works, though he died in their ſtead, and his Death ſecured their releaſe and happineſs; becauſe the Law-giver in the Covenant of Redemption admitted and promiſed this; and the Goſpel doth proclaim this, and aſſure Chriſtians, that they ſhall be treated as believers; yea, and as if themſelves had obeyed and ſatisfied, *viz.* as to all the bleſſings promiſed to believers. But all this doth not infer, that we paid the price of heaven, or that we legally endured the Wrath of God; there's no *Suretiſhip* that amounts to this, and therefore no *Suretiſhip righteouſneſs* that connotes it. Chriſt was not our *Money-Surety* in the Law of works, in performing the Law of Redemption, and therefore we cannot be ſaid to do and ſuffer what Chriſt did, *equally* with him; nor conſequently, to be *as righteous as he* in Equality. But ſhould it be urged,

Obj.

Obj. *Chriſt was made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law; that we might receive the Adoption of Sons.* SERM. II. Gal. iv. 4, 5.

Anſ. (1.) I MIGHT ſhew, that the Context confines this to the following ſenſe, *viz.* Chriſt was made under the *Jewiſh Law*, (delivered Four hundred years after the Promiſe,) which could not *give Life*, nor *the Spirit*; under which Law the *Jewiſh* believers were *ſhut up*, and it was *their Schoolmaſter*, and they as Servants *in bondage under the elements of the world*, that is, the Ceremonies; and ſo were far from the deſigned *liberty* of adopted Sons. But Chriſt was *made under this Law*, to redeem and reſcue thoſe *Jewiſh* believers from this *bondage*, and to bring the *Gentiles* as well as they, and at one inſtant with them, to the Goſpel-freedom and liberty; which is called *the adoption of Sons*; even a Liberty from the *Jewiſh yoke* and bondage, which many were ſtill fond of. (Conſult *Gal.* iii. and iv.) In this ſenſe, it is not the Law of Innocency, as a proper Covenant of works, that is meant by the Law under which Chriſt was made. The Law of innocency or works, had not in it theſe ceremonial Ordinances, and the like. Yet,

(2.) I GRANT, that Chriſt in taking our nature, became *a Servant*, and was thus ſubject to the Law of Innocency, to its precepts, and its puniſhments, as *a Medi-*

SERM. II.

Mediator, according to the terms adjuſted in the Covenant of *Redemption*. But,

(3.) How follows it, that becauſe he obliged himſelf in the Covenant of *Redemption*, that he would in our nature be *ſubject to the Law* for our redemption; that therefore he was *ſuch a Surety* in what he did, as that we legally did what he did; and that, in the eſtimate and ſentence of that Law, as a Law of works? It is ſo far from concluding this, that it concludes the contrary. We did it not, becauſe he did it; he did it *to redeem us*, we were to do it to prevent the need of redemption; and had we done it, there had been no room for his doing it: And obeying alone would have ſerved our turn before Sin, and neither our obeying nor ſuffering could ſerve the turn after Sin. Further,

(4.) CHRIST did not then *become a Surety* or an undertaker to die for us, by being made under the Law; but he was *made under the Law*, becauſe he had undertaken to die for us. His very being made under the Law of works, was but the performance of a *previous engagement* to the Law-giver; this being one Article in the Cove-
Heb. x. 5. nant of Redemption, That he ſhould *take our nature*, and be *a Servant* under the
Iſa. liii. 10. Law, and *make his Soul an offering for Sin.* Can any infer then, that becauſe Chriſt was made under the Law, in performance of his *prior engagement* to redeem loſt Sinners;

ners; to which engagement *these Sinners* were never obliged; that therefore these Sinners did truly do and suffer, whatever Christ did and suffered to redeem and save them? It is true, that but for Sinners, and the Law, and Divine Justice, Christ needed not to enter into any obligation, that he would be under the Law, and die for Sinners, and obey to make the Law honourable. But what is this *to make us Principals* in that Bond, whereby he became obliged to come under the Law, and die for us? The Law is honoured, and Justice satisfied, but not *by us*, though *for us*; since he alone stood obliged by his Bond, to honour the Law, and to satisfy Justice. It was not from any obligation the Law of works had upon him, that he became obliged to be *a Subject*; or if he became a Subject, that he *must die* whilst he was an innocent person: Nor was it the Law of works, that gave him *a right to his Reward*, if he should obey and die; this Law never promised, his Death should be *a Ransom for all*, and he be *glorious* as a Redeemer. The Law of works hath nothing of this; Christ had to do with a higher Law, before he submitted to this; a Law wherein he was Principal, transacting without us, though for our recovery. I'll give you an instance to illustrate this: There is a Law made, that he that commits High-treason shall die; a Thousand persons commit

SERM. II.

SERM. II.

mit High-treaſon in various degrees, and are condemned; but the Law-giver, or abſolute ſupreme Ruler, makes a Law, that if ſuch a great Monarch will become his Subject, and die to expiate this Treaſon, thoſe condemned Traitors ſhall be forgiven, and releaſed in ſuch a time and way, as is agreed between the Law-giver and this Monarch: This Monarch becomes a Subject, and dies to expiate the Treaſon, and deliver the Traitors. Now here the Law-giver is ſatisfied, the end of the Law is anſwered; the Monarch dies in the ſtead and place of the Traitors; and they in a fit time and way are releaſed. But yet they cannot be ſaid to die, nor to pay a Ranſom for their Lives; much leſs can it be ſaid, that they paid as much as the Monarch. But again,

2 *R.* WE did not equally with Chriſt, *perform the legal conditions* of redemption: Otherwiſe, we equally vindicated the honour of Divine Juſtice, as Chriſt did; we purchaſed the Spirit's Operation, and Faith, equally with Chriſt; we *redeemed* ourſelves, and *bought the Church* with Chriſt's blood, equally as Chriſt did; all which are notoriouſly falſe. The ground of the Conſequences is this, He that equally performs that by which a thing is effected or procured, doth equally effect or procure that thing: Therefore if we performed that equally with Chriſt, by which the honour

honour of Divine Justice is vindicated, we did equally honour Divine Justice: If we paid the Price of our Redemption, and that whereby Faith and the Church is bought, in equality with Christ, we did redeem our selves, and purchase Faith and the Church, equally with Christ, the performed conditions being the Ransom and Price. SERM. II.

3 *R.* If we performed the legal conditions equally with Christ, we then are *entitled* equally with Christ, *to all the Rewards* proposed to Christ upon those conditions. The ground of the Consequence is this, Whatever is proposed and promised upon any conditions, is equally due to all who equally perform those conditions: Therefore if Christ is to have *a name above every name*, and *all Judgment* and *Authority* committed to him, for obeying the Law and dying; then if we have equally with Christ so obeyed and died, we are to have *a name above every name*, &c.

4 *R.* If we performed the legal conditions equally with Christ, then we have *an equal share* in whatever contributed to make Christ's Sufferings and Obedience *satisfactory* and *meritorious*; and so the Influence of the Divine Nature, into the value of all the performed conditions, was equally ours, as it was Christ's. The reason of the Consequence is this, Whatever is *essential* to the performed conditions, must be equally ascribed to all that equally

SERM. II. performed those conditions; and none of you will doubt, That it was not sufficient to redeem Sinners, that the mere acts were done, and the sufferings endured; but that they were to be done and suffered by him, that was habitually holy to perfection; yea, by him, that was *the Son of God* in our nature: The value resulted from the Dignity of his Person; and had he not been *the Son of God*, he could not make Satisfaction for Sin by his obedience: It then unavoidably follows, That if we equally obeyed and satisfied with Christ, then we are accounted legally to have the Dignity of the Divine Nature in what we performed, and that in equality with Christ; a thing the Law never obliged innocent man to, and a thing too great to be assumed by sinful wretches.

WHAT need I more Arguments to prove, that we did not equally with Christ perform the legal conditions? Though we have the same Right to a freedom from condemnation and to eternal glory as if we had, yet we are excluded from that *carnal Pride*, in saying we did it legally ourselves, and are engaged against *Idleness* and *Security* in our obedience to the terms of the application of what Christ hath performed. If we dare not pretend, that we satisfied Justice, vindicated the honour of God's Government, purchased the Spirit of grace and Faith, and redeemed ourselves, yea, and

and the whole Church, in equality with Christ; if we abhor pretending to the same Glory and Authority, which belongs to Christ as Redeemer, in equality with him; if we tremble at pretending to have an equal Share with Christ, in the dignity and value of his obedience, from the glory of his Divine Person as the Son of God; we must renounce this conceit, that we *equally performed the conditions*, the reward whereof is our Redemption and Salvation; and therefore should renounce, that we are *equally righteous* as Christ. The performance of these conditions being the legal Righteousness of Christ, and that for which we are justified and saved, it is not to be equally ascribed to us and Christ; and for any Pretence to it from its being *a Suretiship righteousness*, you have seen there is no Suretiship of that kind, as will infer that we performed whatever Christ performed, or suffered what Christ suffered for our Redemption, much less equally with him. SERM. II.

THOUGH I might stop here, for it is the Righteousness of Christ, as it was the performance of the legal conditions, which is intended by *Suretiship-righteousness*, in respect of which we are said to be *equally righteous* with Christ; yet I will proceed further, and observe,

[3.] IT is not true, that we are *equally righteous* as Christ, as he is righteous with respect to his *Right to the reward*, upon

SERM. II. his performing the conditions thereof. If any thing would afford a ſhadow for the aſſertion, this is likelieſt to do it; though alas, the thing intended is of a higher nature, even the performance of the condition it ſelf; but yet, even in this lower Senſe it is ungrounded. By *the Reward*, I mean, what was promiſed to Chriſt for himſelf or others, in conſideration of what he was to do and ſuffer. I ſhall briefly give you ſome conſiderable *differences* between *Chriſt's Right* to the Reward, and *our Right*, even though it is in Chriſt's Right we obtain all ſaving bleſſings.

1. CHRIST's Right was *by his own Purchaſe*, but we have a Right *by Gift*, and do receive every benefit as the effect of his Purchaſe. He bought a Pardon for penitent believers by his own blood: He graciouſly gives believers this Pardon ſecured by his title. Is there nothing peculiarly honourable to Chriſt, diſtinct from us? Sure, he hath the Glory of the Purchaſe, and of his Beneficence; whilſt we have reaſon for humble Gratitude, as needing this, and receiving it as a Gift, though he makes it ſafe to us. *Rev.* i. 5, 6.

2. CHRIST is righteous, as *the Subject* in whom Righteouſneſs inheres and formally is; but Believers have it *by Imputation*, and hold all *in dependance* on it as in Chriſt. The Purchaſe is peculiar to him, and the Right reſulting therefrom, never alienable

alienable from his Person; though it be so transferred, as to be the plea and security of believers, for what is promised to them: Though it be *upon them*, it is still *in Christ*. Surely then, here is somewhat of a distinct Ground, as to the degree, reason, and manner of denomination: *Subjectively* righteous, and *imputatively* righteous; *Originally* and *independently* righteous, and *dependently* righteous, have not a Sound of *equality*. The Moon that borrows its light from the Sun, and depends on the Sun for light, is not equally light as the Sun, tho' it have the same light. Believers use, and apply themselves daily to this righteousness, as it is *in Christ*, that they may be dealt with according to it. SERM. II. Rom. iii. 22.

3. CHRIST had *nothing forgiven him*, and needs no Forgiveness; but Believers are *forgiven much*, and oft need Forgiveness, and are taught by Christ *daily to pray for it*; yea, much of their happiness and hope lies in God's *forgiving them*. Is there a full Equality between him that is happy by Pardon, yea, is often pardoned actually *after* he is justified and made righteous; and him that never needed a Pardon for himself, yea, in whose Right that Pardon is granted when *so often* needed? Alas! Believers have their Right to blessedness *maintained* by God's frequently forgiving their sinful forfeitures: Without this Forgiveness they would soon be liable to misery, and to be Luk. xi. 4. Rom. iv. 7, 8.

SERM. II. dealt with as unrighteous: And are such *equally righteous* as Christ?

4. IT were intolerably arrogant, for Believers to *plead with God*, so as they might justly do, if they were *equally righteous* as Christ. Dare they say, "Lord, we need "no Pardon from thee, thou forgivest us "nothing; I legally paid the utmost Far-"thing, by perfectly obeying and suffering Joh. xvii. 24. "too. *I will*, that this and that be done "for me: Thou art *unjust* to me, as well "as to my Surety, and not only unfaith-"ful, if I am denied." Would this sound conscientiously, any more than decently? Have Believers a Right pleadable on this head of *Justice*? And yet Christ is so righteous, that *he* can plead so of Right. Can they be *equally righteous*, whose Claim is so different?

5. WE are not *dealt with*, as if we were *equally righteous* with Christ; and yet God is not *unjust* nor *unfaithful* therein. Believers have *much Sin* in their hearts, frequent Offences they commit; they want much of God's Image, their Graces are very weak and imperfect; the Spirit of God is oft grieved by them, and for it abates his Influences; God is provoked frequently, and therefore hides his face, and rebukes them in displeasure; yea, leaves them under temptations; to say nothing of other *penal Corrections*, as Poverty, cursed Relations, Death and the Fears of it: Yet in all

all *God is righteous*, even when theſe are in- SERM.
flicted *for Sin*; nay, a great part of them II.
is Sin in them, though the with-holding of more Grace is righteous in God, and is oft repeated as penal; yea, indeed, all remains of Sin in our hearts, are the penal effects of our firſt Apoſtacy, not yet removed by Divine Grace. Can any man conſider this, and ſay, Believers in this caſe are *equally righteous* as Chriſt? Hath he no more *a right* to his preſent exalted State, than we have to our preſent freedom from the effects of our Apoſtacy? Or are we *equally righteous*, when all theſe things are juſtly left upon us? Had we *a right* to be *at preſent* free from all Sin and Trouble, to be immediately made fully conformable to Chriſt, ſure we ſhould arrive thereto *even now?* And if we have *not a right* to a preſent freedom from theſe Evils, and enjoyment of the oppoſite Good, we cannot be now *righteous* equally with Chriſt. A preſent right to freedom from Sin *hereafter*, is even in that an Inequality to Chriſt's right, who is entitled to a *preſent* freedom from all that is humbling or afflictive, and never was ſubject to Sin itſelf.

6. CHRIST hath a right to *much more Good*, than we ſhall ever enjoy, or have a right to. Believers have not now, no nor ever ſhall have, a right to a Reward equal to the Redeemer's Crown: He will receive a homage as Redeemer; his human nature

SERM. II.

poſſeſſeth a Glory beyond all created Beings. Now can they be *equally righteous* with Chriſt in matter of right, who have a right to no more than what is abundantly ſhort of his? It is unaccountable, to denominate one *righteous* from the greatneſs or largeneſs of Right, and to conclude them *equally righteous* who have *ſo unequal a Right*, as to the greatneſs of the things they are entitled to, of which this Head ſpeaks; and when there is ſuch a difference in the nature of their right, as applied to them, of which before. Chriſt in his right hath given us many bleſſings, which begin the Felicity he intends to compleat hereafter, according to our various capacities to receive: But he hath not transferred to us *his right* to the Salvation of Millions, to Dominion over Angels, to give out the Fruits of his own Righteouſneſs as he pleaſeth; and many ſuch Pretogatives, that never belong to Believers.

I MIGHT add, We are not ſo *ſolemnly adjudged righteous* as Chriſt is, and that makes an Inequality: And our righteous State is ſuſtained, by a conſtant Interceſſion of Chriſt in his own right. But I think enough is ſaid, to conclude this Point: For if we are not equally holy as Chriſt, nor have equally performed the legal Conditions with Chriſt, nor have an equal right to the Rewards promiſed on thoſe conditions as Chriſt, nor are equally adjudged righteous

righteous by God's ſolemn Sentence as Chriſt was; Where is the leaſt Shadow of doubting, that Believers are *not as righteous* as Chriſt in equality? no, not as to *Suretiſhip-righteouſneſs*, or in any other proper ſenſe. Some however will ſay, SERM. II.

Obj. *If my Surety paid my Debt, I am as free from my Creditor's Arreſt, as if I never owed him any thing: I can tell him, I legally paid him all, and he cannot charge me*, &c. *And therefore I am as righteous as Chriſt.*

Anſ. THE Impropriety of calling God a Creditor, and Sin a Debt, otherwiſe than metaphorically, I have already ſpoken to; The *Socinians* have ſuch an Advantage by it, that all men who underſtand the true way of oppoſing them, quit theſe terms. But,

(1.) SUCH as make this Objection, and urge it to prove that Believers are as *righteous* as Chriſt, muſt confine our Righteouſneſs, as a right only to *impunity*, and not extend it to *poſitive good* as eternal Glory is. And is it not ſtrange, to affirm that Chriſt by his death *only paid a debt*, but merited nothing; and yet to argue, we are as righteous as Chriſt, merely becauſe our debt is paid, which is by his death? What, is not Chriſt's *active obedience* a part of his Righteouſneſs? If it be, then notwithſtanding our Impunity by the payment of our debt, Chriſt is more righteous than us,

as

SERM. II. as having the Merit of his active obedience. And,

(2.) IT is so far from true, that the Believer paid God *all his debt*, that it is true he paid God *not one Penny* of his debt, neither by himself, nor by Christ as a *Money-Surety*. Christ made Satisfaction to God the injured Law-giver, as a *Principal* undertaker to save us in his way; but the Believer never made any Satisfaction to God for the least Sin, as I have fully proved: And therefore it's gross arguing, that I am as righteous as Christ, because I paid all my debt; when I *paid nothing*, but was *forgiven all*. Again,

(3.) THE Believer is contracting *new debts* every day, and were it not for a renewed washing or pardon by Christ's blood still applied, he would be subject to new Arrests. (*Jer.* xxxvi. 3. *Psalm* li. 9. *Matt.* vi. 12.) Is it well argued then, I am as righteous as Christ, when I would daily run myself into Prison; but that I have a Pardon oft repeated in the virtue of his Righteousness? Further,

(4.) THOUGH Pardon in Christ's right will keep a Believer *out of hell*, yet those are unacquainted with the Word and the dealings of God with Believers, that think they feel none of the *bitter fruits of Sin*, and have no experience of any Arrests of displeasure for Sin. (*Rev.* iii. 19. *Amos* iii. 2.) Eternal condemnation is the forest, but not the

the only, effect of Sin. Is it a part of our *Freedom*, that our Lusts are so strong; that the Image of God is so little restored; that God is still so much dishonoured and offended by us? &c. Will this reasoning persuade you? "Because I shall be kept by "Christ's Righteousness *out of hell*, there- "fore I am as righteous as Christ; though "I am still subject to many *penal effects* of "Sin, and know not how much greater "I may yet be subject to." And again,

SERM. II.

(5.) DOTH the *Plea* formed in this Objection, fit the mouth of any true Believer? "Lord, I do not now need thy forgiving me "any thing; nor ever was indebted to thee "for abating me ought: I bore the Punish- "ment legally before I offended, and paid "the Debt before I contracted it: Be but "*just* towards me, and I fear no advantage "thou canst have against me; Let me be "and do what I will or can, I am out of "thy reach: I have, in the eye of thy "Law, suffered what can be inflicted; "nay, I am *as righteous* as Christ himself, "and that *in equality*; therefore thou "mayest as well, and as much, be offend- "ed with him as with me; yea, may'st "as justly *deny him* the Reward of his "Obedience, as *deny me* any part of that "Reward; for I performed the Conditi- "tions in the eye of the Law as much as "he, and have a right equal to his; I am "*equally righteous* with him." Are these

the

SERM. II. the Appreheoſions of an humble broken Heart? Theſe things are as unreaſonable, as if Millions of perſons were liable to die for Robbery, and the King and his only Son ſhould agree, that the Son ſhould die in the room of theſe Millions of Criminals; that they, owning humbly his kindneſs, might be releaſed and honoured, and the Son have the glory of being their Redeemer, and have homage done him as ſuch. Would it not appear ſtrange, if one of theſe after his eſcape by the Prince's death, ſhould ſay to the King, "I owe you nothing for "my Life, I paid you in your Son's dying "for me?" And ſhould ſay to the Son, "I have done and ſuffered as much, in the "eye of the Law, to ſave my Life, as you "did, and deſerve it as much as you; and "have as much Honour due to me for "dying in you, as you have for dying for "us Millions; the King and the Law look "on me, and all ſhould judge me, as juſt "a man as yourſelf." I doubt ſuch a Man might forfeit his claim to Freedom, for want of humble thankfulneſs, and for denying the King's Son the glory of being his Redeemer.

Exh. WITH Sobriety of mind keep an humble Senſe of your diſtance from Chriſt, under the higheſt Privileges he advanceth you to. Adore his Grace, that through his blood you are righteous as pardoned believers, but dread comparing with him: He will,

will, and it's fit he ſhould, *in all things have the Preheminence*; and ſure to be *more righteous than us* in all reſpects, is one of thoſe things: What can be a tenderer part of his Prerogative? SERM. II. Col. i. 18.

XI *Prop.* NEITHER Faith, nor any Work of believers, are *any Righteouſneſs*, that have any ſhare or place with Chriſt's righteouſneſs in *Juſtification*, as this is before deſcribed. Our Graces do neither make atonement, nor merit pardon of the leaſt Sin, or the conferring of the loweſt benefit. No Acts of ours are a jot of our Righteouſneſs, or right to pardon or glory in a way of Juſtice: Juſtice could not allow them that place, they being *imperfect*, and the actions of Sinners: God hath no eye to *our Works*, as any *procuring cauſe* of his imputing Chriſt's righteouſneſs, or of his pardoning, abſolving, or accepting us.

READER, Becauſe my enlargement on this Head is long, that it may be better comprehended, I ſhall divide it into ſeveral Heads.

1. I HAVE already told you that *Juſtification* is that Act of God, whereby he imputes *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs* to a believer, and thereupon pardons, abſolves from condemnation, accepts and adopts him; whereby he hath a right to glory, and is adjudged, one free from condemnation, as if he had not ſinned, and an Heir of Glory, as

if

SERM. II. if he had obeyed the whole Law. This is to *make us righteous*, as in Juſtification.

2. IN Juſtification thus conſidered, the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt* is that, which is regarded by God, and influential into all, as the only Merit, and procuring cauſe. His Obedience active and paſſive, is the only legal Conſideration, on which God pardons, abſolves, adopts, or gives a right to Glory; yea, it is Chriſt's very Right, wherein God doth pardon, abſolve, *&c.*

3. JUSTIFICATION, as including theſe benefits, ſtands *entire*, as to its cauſes, *antecedently* to a believer's intereſt therein. It's a bleſſing purchaſed by Chriſt; it's offered to Sinners, and included in the Promiſe. A juſtifying Righteouſneſs, wherein or whereby a Sinner is to be pardoned and entitled to Glory, is not to be wrought out by men; it's already fulfilled by Chriſt; and theſe Effects of it are lodged in the Goſpel, as Chriſt's *deed of gift*, with his title, to be applied to all that are made partakers thereof.

4. To be juſtified *actually*, is to be made actual partakers of a Goſpel-right to theſe Immunities and Privileges *in Chriſt's righteouſneſs*, as it is imputed to us by God, in the applicatory Sentence of the Goſpel-Promiſe. We have for Chriſt's obedience *a right to Pardon, &c.* given us; and thereupon are pardoned, and to be dealt with and accepted as ſuch.

5. GOD

5. God in and by the Goſpel hath deſcribed and determined, who ſhall be thus actually juſtified, and this by *deſcriptive Qualifications:* They are Sinners condemnable by the Law, (hence called *ungodly,*) but not unbelieving impenitent Sinners; for God juſtifies none, but whom by the Goſpel he promiſeth to juſtify, Now if the Goſpel promiſed Juſtification to all Sinners *as ſuch*, or to all impenitent unbelieving Sinners, then *all Sinners*, all impenitent unbelieving Sinners, would be juſtified as ſoon as they are ſuch; and would ceaſe to be juſtified, when they ceaſe to be unbelieving impenitent Sinners. But God by his Word hath poſitively declared, that ſuch as theſe he will not juſtify whilſt they are ſuch, but leaves them *under condemnation*, and *the Wrath of God abideth on them.* God's purpoſe of a better State for any, doth not prevent their being at preſent in this worſer State: It is his juſtifying act, that changeth their condition, from a liableneſs to condemnation, to a Right to Impunity from deſtructive evils; as it was his condemning act, which altered their State from a Right to Impunity, to an obnoxiouſneſs to ruin: This *condemning act* was by the Law, that *abſolving act* is by the Goſpel. And therefore, Serm. II. Rom. iv. 5. Joh. iii. 36.

6. Whatever God by his Goſpel makes *neceſſary* in a perſon whom he promiſes to juſtify, *all that*, and *nothing but that*,

SERM. II.

that, is abſolutely neceſſary *in* the perſon who ſhall be juſtified. I do not ſpeak of what is neceſſary in a perſon *after* he is juſtified, but what is *neceſſary in him* on whom God's juſtifying act doth terminate. We may thus judge then, what is made *neceſſary* in the perſon to be juſtified: Whoever God promiſeth to juſtify, as deſcribed by any perſonal character, ſuch as *a believer*, &c. muſt have this character, to be juſtified: Whatever God promiſeth Pardon to, as *Repentance*, is neceſſary to obtaining Pardon: And whatever is *contrary* to that, (for which he declareth that he will, notwithſtanding Goſpel-Grace, continue the Sentence of condemnation on Sinners, and deny them mercy,) muſt be removed, or it excludes from Juſtification: So that when he ſays, *If the wicked turn not, he ſhall die*; converſion is thereby made neceſſary. We may know therefore by theſe Rules, what kind of perſon he muſt be, whom God by his Goſpel doth juſtify: God will not deny it to any, to whom the Goſpel promiſeth it; nor can he by the Goſpel grant it to him, whom he declares he will deny it to; yea, on whom he ſtill more does bind condemnation.

Ezek. iii. 19.

7. FAITH in Chriſt hath a peculiar aptneſs, and is more eſpecially honoured in the *firſt application* of God's juſtifying act upon a Chriſtian; though nothing can be wanting,

wanting, which God hath made neceſſary, in him whom he will juſtify. This acknowledgeth Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs; and by it we *return to him*, as the way to the Father, and own *his authority*, which is the reward of his Mediation. This is our conjugal Conſent, and the band of Union on our part, with Chriſt as *our Huſband*, Head, and entire Saviour. It includes all that regard, which is appropriated to Chriſt as Redeemer; and therefore we are ſaid to be *juſtified by Faith*; and not by any other Grace, as I remember. But yet Forgiveneſs, is promiſed to other things, eſpecially to *Repentance*; and we are called to *repent*, with a Promiſe of *blotting out our Sins*, and to *turn to God, that we may be forgiven.*

SERM. II.

1 Pet. ii. 25. Joh. v. 27.

2 Cor. xi. 2.

Rom. v. 1.

Act. iii. 19. Act. xxvi. 18.

WHEN I have conſidered, that we are ſtill ſaid to be *juſtified by Faith*, and yet *Repentance* is ſo abſolutely required to the Pardon of Sin; I have been apt to think, that the Spirit of God ſeems to inſtruct us, That Juſtification in the *firſt part* of it, *viz.* the imputing Chriſt's righteouſneſs, and inveſting us in his right to Pardon and other bleſſings, is eſpecially applied to *Faith*; and yet our enjoying actual Pardon, upon our Inveſtiture in Chriſt's right, is promiſed to *Repentance*: As if God would aſcribe the *firſt application* of Chriſt's righteouſneſs to that Grace, which more eſpecially acknowledgeth the Redeemer, whoſe Righteouſ-

SERM. II.

neſs it is by which we are juſtified; and yet, that *Sin* which is Treaſon againſt God, *ſhould not be forgiven*, even for Chriſt's ſake, *without repentance*, wherein God is more eſpecially acknowledged as our God and rightful Law-giver; whence the Sum of our Miniſtry is made, *Repentance towards God, and Faith towards the Lord Jeſus.* If there be any weight in this, (which I only offer to conſideration,) then *Faith* is more eſpecially made the Condition of the *firſt part* of Juſtification, *viz.* the application of Chriſt's righteouſneſs; and yet *Repentance* alſo is made the expreſs Condition of the *ſecond part* of Juſtification, *viz.* actual Pardon, (that great Privilege poſſeſſed by us,) with a right to what this Pardon entitleth to. Hereby the dignity of the Law-giver, and the honour of the Redeemer, are diſtinctly provided for in the Juſtification of a Sinner; yea, the Goſpel-order is preſerved, for by Chriſt we come and return unto God, whom we had by Sin forſaken. Yet remember, that *Repentance* is ſtill a concomitant of *Faith*, whatever Priority, as an expreſt Condition, I aſſign to it; for no utterly impenitent perſon can put forth an act of ſaving or juſtifying Faith.

Acts xx. 21.

8. OUR bleſſed Lord exerts a governing *Authority* in a way of Grace, or *Grace* in a way of governing Authority, in the appointing and requiring what he makes neceſſary in the perſon to be juſtified. He *commands* men *to believe*, with a Promiſe that

1 Joh. iii. 23.

that they ſhall be juſtified *if they do believe*, which is the Scope of the Goſpel: He plainly threatens *all that will not believe*, that they *ſhall not be juſtified* if they continue in unbelief: He hath appointed Miniſters to uſe the bleſſedneſs of a juſtified ſtate, as a motive to men's believing, or coming to Chriſt. Thus it is alſo, as to *Repentance* in order to Pardon, &c. SERM. II. Joh. iii. 18, 36.

HERE then is the *Authority* of a Law-giver, yet the *Grace* of a Redeemer: Here's *a Law* in the obliging power of the Command, and the certain connexion between the duty and the promiſed benefit; and yet here is *Grace*, mere Grace, in the adjuſtment of the Sanction, as to the matter it contains, and the merit it refers to. This, as to us, is governing *Grace*, and not governing *Juſtice*: For it is not Juſtice, that adjuſts the benefit, with reſpect to the duty, as meritorious thereof; here's nothing as *of debt* to us *for believing*, yet a certainty of being juſtified *upon believing*; here's no Pardon as *a debt for repenting*, yet a Pardon *ſure upon repenting*. Divine Juſtice was honoured in Chriſt's fulfilling the Law of works, where God diſplayed his governing Juſtice; yea, it is honoured with reſpect to Chriſt, in God's giving all benefits in Chriſt's right, and as Chriſt's *proper* Reward: Yet as to us, it is *of Grace*, that a Believer ſhould be thus *ſure* to be juſtified. But though Grace be thus advanced in the *matter given*,

SERM. II. yet here's Authority expreſſed in the *manner of giving*, and Divine Government maintained according to the preſent ſtate of redeemed Sinners. Some obedience ſhall be yielded, though perfect obedience is become impoſſible; there ſhall be the reins of a Sanction on our necks, though the Sanction of the Law of works hath and muſt condemn us, if Chriſt relieves not from it: Fear and Hope in us ſhall not be uſeleſs to us, though we were by the Fall, in a caſe, as to ourſelves, utterly deſperate; yet as to Election, and Chriſt's Undertaking, eventually ſafe: There ſhall be a *Law of Faith* to judge and ſave us by, though we daily tranſgreſs the *Law of works*, and by every tranſgreſſion are *liable to the curſe*.

Rom. iii. 27. Gal. iii. 10.

I MIGHT, had I time, eaſily prove what I have aſſerted, and give you the great uſefulneſs of this Point, that *the Goſpel*, by which the bleſſings of Chriſt are diſpenſed, *is a Law*, or a diſplay of Grace in a way of Authority and Government: But I will only glance at the following things. (1.) Hereby the Goſpel is ſaid to be obeyed and diſobeyed. *Rom.* x. 16. 2 *Theſſ.* i. 8. 2 *Cor.* ix. 13. (2.) Men become culpable as Rejecters of its benefits. *Acts* xiii. 41, 46. (3.) All Goſpel-benefits become fit and ſtrong motives to Goſpel-duty. *Acts* ii. 38. (4.) The Benefits are ſuſpended infallibly, till the Conditions be performed.

formed. *Luke* xiii. 3. (5.) They that obey the Goſpel, may be ſure of the promiſed benefits, and know how to try their Intereſt and conclude it. *Heb.* v. 9. (6.) The Goſpel-bleſſings may be truly offered to all, and all charged to accept of them, by complying with the Conditions. *Acts* xiii. 38. (7.) The Conditions hereby are deſcribed, ſtated, urged, and not left uncertain. 1 *Cor.* xiii. 2. (8.) A Rule of Judgment is hereby fixed, whereby God is juſtified in ſaving ſome, and damning others, who yet had the very ſame offers, invitations, and calls. *Rom.* ii. 16. (9.) They that have diſobeyed the Goſpel, are juſtly liable to ſorer Puniſhments and Vengeance, than would have fallen on them for their firſt Apoſtacy, or for tranſgreſſing of the Law. *Matt.* xi. 24. *Heb.* x. 29. (10.) Here is an apt means to excite to diligence, watchfulneſs, faith, repentance, and holineſs; and to prevent ſloth, deſpair, preſumption, and diſobedience. SERM. II.

I APPEAL to the Conſciences of men, Whether fallen men are more like to be governed by telling them, "You are under no Law but the Law of works, "which requires all Graces and Duties "alike, and all to be done *perfectly* without Sin, or you muſt eternally periſh; "though, it is true, if God pleaſe to juſtify you by Chriſt's righteouſneſs, then "you have *legally fulfilled* this Law, and

SERM. II.

" you are juſtified by it, and ſhall go to " heaven. But God requires no Duty or " Care on your part, in order to be juſ- " tified by Chriſt's righteouſneſs; nor " doth he command you to act any Grace, " with a promiſe of any benefit upon that " act; nor threaten you with any damage, " whatever Sin you commit: So that you " have Faith as a Sign, but not as a Condi- " tion of your Pardon; nor ought you to " obey any Command, as a means of good " to you, but only in gratitude, that Chriſt " hath done all for you." Or is it not more like to influence men, if they are told, " God hath ſet down this authorita- " tive Rule, to give Sinners the beneficial " fruits of Chriſt's death, and commands " you to obey it; That though you are " loſt, yet *if you believe and repent*, you " *ſhall be pardoned*; if not, *the wrath of* " *God will abide on you:* Turn to God, and " you ſhall live; if not, you ſhall die: " Fight the good fight, and if you over- " come, you ſhall be crowned, and in " due ſeaſon you ſhall reap if you faint " not; but if you draw back, God will " have no pleaſure in you: Be fruitful, " for if you be barren you are nigh unto " curſing, and your end is to be burned: " Uſe the talents you have, for if you im- " prove them, God will reward you with " greater bleſſedneſs; but if you hide them " in a napkin, you ſhall for your unpro- " fitableneſs

" fitableneſs be caſt into the lake that burns " with fire and brimſtone: Subdue your " luſts, for if Sin reign in you, you ſhall " die; but if you mortify the deeds of the " body, you ſhall live; *&c.* O then at- " tend the means of Grace, look unto " Chriſt, be earneſt with God, watch and " ſtrive as for your Lives." I appeal, I ſay, to the Conſciences of men, Whether is more like to influence men to a compliance with the deſign of Redemption, and to obedience to God, the firſt of theſe, or the laſt? And I am ſure, this laſt is the way God chuſeth, for it's his own words; though we are not by this way excluded from adding arguments that may alſo excite to Gratitude. But are not theſe *words of Authority*, the dictates of a Ruler, and yet not the Law of works, which promiſeth nothing of Good to the imperfect, and bindeth Death for the leaſt Sin?

SERM. II.

9. THE Goſpel enjoineth nothing on men for the *impetration* or *purchaſing* of Juſtification, or any other benefit; but that they may receive Juſtification, and every benefit, as the effect of Chriſt's Merits. Chriſt hath bought all by his obedience, and by the Goſpel preſcribeth the way how he in his own right will give what he hath acquired. As the Goſpel is his Teſtament, he deſcribeth his Legatees; as it's God's Covenant, our conſent to it is neceſſary to receive its bleſſings.

SERM. II.

10. THE *uſe of Faith* in order to Juſtification is, that it renders the Sinners the ordained objects of God's juſtifying act and gift, according to his own Goſpel-rule. Juſtification brings the Righteouſneſs by which we are pardoned; but God promiſeth to juſtify him that hath Faith, and ſaith he will not juſtify him that hath not Faith. Doth not Faith diſtinguiſh him that hath Faith, from another that hath not Faith? And doth not God declare, he will deal very differently with him that hath Faith, and him that hath no Faith? he'll juſtify the one, and ſtill condemns the other. And it's the ſame, as to any other Condition of any other promiſed benefit: The Condition is not that for which the benefit is given, but it renders a man the Perſon, to whom God hath promiſed to give that benefit in Chriſt's right.

11. ALL *endeavours* after Faith, are endeavours after Juſtification; and all *neglects* of Faith are neglects of Juſtification. This is plain; for if the object of God's juſtifying act be the Believer, then whatever tends to make him a Believer, tends to bring him into a juſtified State; and whatever tends to hinder him to believe, tends to keep him him out of a juſtified State. It's the ſame as to all other Promiſes made to any Grace or Duty: Though all the Promiſes are made and performed in Chriſt's right; yet when he deſcribes the perſon by

any

any Grace or Duty who ſhall receive the good promiſed, we purſue that good promiſed, by following after that Grace or Duty to which the Promiſe refers. Therein we look to Chriſt's righteouſneſs with a juſt hope, when we look to him in his Promiſe, and follow that which he hath aſſured the fruits of his Righteouſneſs upon. SERM II.

12. GOD now doth, and will hereafter more ſolemnly *judge men's Faith*, and men by their Faith, as far as he hath made that Faith neceſſary to any bleſſing. For,

(1.) GOD ſays in his Goſpel, I will, in and for Chriſt's righteouſneſs, forgive *him that believes*, and no other; yea, all unbelievers ſhall be ſtill *condemned*, *becauſe they believe not*: Chriſt's righteouſneſs ſhall not be applied to them for Pardon. And, John iii. 16, 18.

(2.) IF the Goſpel hath deſcribed what this *Faith in truth* is, and hath warned us of all *falſe Faith* as vain and inſufficient to our pardon; if theſe two things be true, Can you imagine, [1.] That God doth make no Judgment of *that Faith*, whether it be true or falſe? Are all ſorts of Faith alike in his account; a dead Faith, and a living; a feigned Faith, and an unfeigned Faith? Doth he give and execute the Pardon, without any regard to their being ſuch believers as his Goſpel appoints? Surely he that ſays, *Be watchful, and ſtrengthen the things that are ready to die, for I have not found thy Works perfect before God*; James ii. 14, 17. Gal. v. 6. Rev. iii. 2.

doth

SERM. II. doth diſtinguiſh between the Faith the Promiſe is made to, and the Faith which the Promiſe is not made to; nay, which he threatens as hypocritical. Or can you think, [2.] That God makes no Judgment concerning a man's *Intereſt*, or *no Intereſt* in the promiſed Pardon, with any regard to his having true Faith, or his not having it? The Queſtion is not, What *righteouſneſs* that Pardon is founded on? for that is Chriſt's, and the Pardon connotes it: But the Queſtion is, Is this or that man *the perſon* to whom God hath promiſed to give that Pardon? Doth it by that Promiſe belong to this believer, or that unbeliever? I aſk then, Will not God judge this man by having true Faith, to be *the very man* the Pardon by that Promiſe belongs to, and that the Pardon doth not belong to the other man for want of true Faith; nay, that becauſe he hath not Faith, he is ſubject to the threatnings denounced againſt unbelievers? God's preſent dealings with ſouls according to his Goſpel is a kind of *virtual Sentence*, but at the great day he will ſolemnly judge *according to the Goſpel*. The Work of that day will be, to ſentence men's Faith to be true or falſe, upon full evidence of its truth or falſhood, and to convince the world that God hath pardoned all believers, and none but believers; and to condemn publickly all unbelievers, and ſolemnize before all, the happy State of thoſe

Rom. ii. 16.

thoſe pardoned believers. The Caſe is the ſame, as to every other Grace or Duty to which God hath promiſed any benefit in the Goſpel. As far as God makes any Duty a neceſſary Condition of any benefit by the Goſpel, he will judge us according to that Duty; and if we totally want it, that benefit will be with-held: He that *did not repent*, ſhall be denied the *blotting out of Sins* at that day. *Acts* iii. 19. SERM. II.

13. HENCE men can be ſaid to be *juſtified by Faith* as a ſort of work, no otherwiſe than thus: That Chriſt *adjudgeth* a man to be *a believer* who is ſo, and his Faith a true Faith; and that he is to be *dealt with* as a true believer according to the Goſpel-promiſe.

JUSTIFICATION in this ſenſe, is quite *another thing*, than Juſtification by Chriſt's righteouſneſs, or by Faith as it connotes that Object. This is not pardoning, abſolving, and accepting a guilty undone Sinner, which muſt be upon a righteouſneſs adequate to the Law, and ſatisfying to Juſtice: No, no: It is but a determination of a *particular cauſe*, viz. He is a true believer, and not an unbelieving hypocrite: And yet it is of great importance to our *main cauſe*, being that God hath ſaid, Chriſt's righteouſneſs ſhall be imputed to none but the true Believer: And if we muſt be *judged* whether we are Believers or no, we muſt be *ſentenced* to be believers or unbelievers;

and

SERM. II. and if we be ſentenced to be Believers, we are *ſo far juſtified* by Faith as a ſort of work: And if our Faith be *tried* by our words, or other works, our Faith is juſtified by thoſe words and works, and we are *juſtified* as to this cauſe in trial by thoſe *words and works*; that is, We are adjudged not to be *unbelievers*; nor to be merely *ſuch believers* whoſe Faith was not evidenced by ſuch words and works. *Mat.* xii. 37. *James* ii. 17, 21, 25. The matter is the ſame, as to any thing the Goſpel indiſpenſably requireth, and concerning which we muſt be judged.

14. IN the like manner, Faith can be called our *ſubordinate righteouſneſs*, no otherwiſe than as it is the *performed Condition* which the Goſpel requireth in the perſon, to whom God promiſeth to impute the righteouſneſs of Chriſt for Juſtification, or for actual forgiveneſs and abſolution.

IT is not the *legal righteouſneſs*; for the Law would condemn any man, notwithſtanding his Faith, if he had not Chriſt's righteouſneſs imputed to him. It is not the righteouſneſs that is imputed for Juſtification, as that in the *right whereof* Pardon and Acceptance is promiſed, or ſtands. It is not the *Merit* that God regards, either in making or applying the Promiſe. It is not a righteouſneſs by *Acceptilation*, (which the *Socinians* call it,) that is, it is not reckoned inſtead of a legal or perfect righteouſneſs,

teouſneſs, which were to exclude Chriſt's Satisfaction, and ſet it inſtead of his righteouſneſs. It is not a righteouſneſs that makes up Chriſt's righteouſneſs, or *at all* ſerves to the *ſame* end. It's not a righteouſneſs *by or for which* God juſtifies us, that is, God doth not pardon or accept us for this. SERM. II.

But Chriſt having a full Righteouſneſs, it is this that he promiſeth to impute for Juſtification to all that will believe ſincerely; requiring and commanding Sinners to believe in him, with this Promiſe, That if they will believe, they ſhall be juſtified by his Righteouſneſs; and if they believe not, they ſhall not be juſtified by his Righteouſneſs, but die in their Sins, notwithſtanding the full Righteouſneſs that is in him, and the offers made to them. I ſay, As far as this Promiſe gives the Believer a right to the promiſed benefit, his Faith is that upon which he receives that right; and ſo far the Goſpel makes him righteous by his Faith; that is, He is the man whom the Goſpel aſſures that benefit to; which it gives the unbeliever no right to, but directly excludes him. So that this Faith is no righteouſneſs, that is *any part* of Juſtification, which is the *Benefit* promiſed, and ſubſiſts entirely in its own cauſes: But what righteouſneſs it is, depends wholly on the authority, tenor, and truth of the Goſpel, as the inſtrument whereby God applies

Chriſt's

SERM. II. Chriſt's righteouſneſs to us for our Juſtification. If the Goſpel doth not promiſe to juſtify one that hath true Faith, though it be imperfect, then indeed Faith is no Condition, nor at all a Conformity to the Goſpel, as defining the Condition; and if the Goſpel doth not by its Promiſe or Sanction, give any *Right* to the benefit promiſed upon performing the Condition, then indeed Faith muſt not be called a *ſubordinate righteouſneſs.* But if the Goſpel aſſures to every true *Believer* Juſtification by Chriſt's righteouſneſs, then true Faith is the performed Condition; and thereupon the Goſpel gives him an infallible title: Yea, this Goſpel is his title by God's gracious Will, to his partaking of Juſtification by Chriſt's righteouſneſs; yea, to the Imputation of Chriſt's righteouſneſs for Juſtification: But ſtill it is *Chriſt's righteouſneſs* that juſtifies, and *only* that; though it be thus aſſuredly applied to him that believes.

15. FAITH itſelf, much leſs any other Grace or Work, is not the righteouſneſs, or *any part* of the righteouſneſs, wherein a Believer is accepted, pardoned, or glorified, or wherein he ſtands before the Juſtice of God; nor is it pleadable againſt the Law of works, or the charge of ſin.

IT is Chriſt's righteouſneſs alone, that pleads for Believers in all theſe reſpects; this anſwers the Law, and for this we are releaſed from the Curſe. By this Righteouſneſs

couſneſs our Pardon and Heaven were purchaſed, and for it they are given: That there is a Pardon, that there is a Glory for fallen man, is owing to Chriſt; and that Believers have theſe given to them, is alſo in Chriſt's right, though his Goſpel aſſures them to Believers. Yea, it is for Chriſt's righteouſneſs that the Spirit works Faith in any perſon. Faith puts in no claim of Merit, nor can it ſtand before *governing Juſtice*, nor admit a trial before God as Creator, as what entitles any to his Rewards. But to the Praiſe of divine Grace and Wiſdom, our bleſſed Redeemer will own true Faith, as that which he hath ordained to be a Means of inveſting us in his bleſſed Righteouſneſs, and what renders a Sinner certain of the fruits of his Merits. The Believer hath a *Right* by the Goſpel to plead all Chriſt's obedience as the Security of his Pardon and Glory; and he hath the Goſpel to plead as what gives him, upon his believing, a *Right to uſe* that Plea. What Chriſt hath done anſwers all the benefits; Chriſt's Goſpel applies what Chriſt hath ſo done, and gives the benefits for it. Faith is the Condition of the perſon, to whom the Goſpel applies Chriſt's righteouſneſs, and gives the benefits: But it is not that, for which any thing is given, or by which it is purchaſed: It determineth the Legatees in Chriſt's Teſtamentary Abſolution and Gifts, which he

SERM. II. bequeaths to *Believers*, and confines to them therein.

Exh. 1. BE watchful, that you ſet no Grace, Duty, or Work of yours into the place of Chriſt's righteouſneſs. Do not think any thing you do, anſwers the Law of works, or is any way proportioned to governing Juſtice. Dread a thought, that any thing is *due* to thy beſt Duty, as *of debt*. Whatever ſeem to be good works, are wholly vain, highly provoking to God, affronting to Chriſt, and Snares to yourſelves, if you think they are a Chriſt, or *inſtead of* a Chriſt to you: And this you are guilty of, if you think you hereby atone for your Sins, or merit Glory at the hand of governing Juſtice. Will you rob Chriſt of his Glory, who ſatisfied for all your Sins, and purchaſed all bleſſings alone; and who freely gives you but the fruits of his own Purchaſe, whatever Terms he inſiſts on for the diſpenſing of his Gifts, in a way moſt honourable to himſelf, and profitable to you?

Rom. iv. 4. 5.

Exh. 2. YET do not thruſt your Graces or Duties out of the place, where Chriſt by the Goſpel-promiſes hath ſet them. He knew what was conſiſtent with his Honour, and that it would not be injurious thereto, to inſiſt upon Terms of the application of his Righteouſneſs, and the communication of the Fruits thereof in a way of governing Grace; though as Sovereign

vereign Proprietor, he gave the power to perform thoſe Terms. He thinks not himſelf debaſed, by giving out his Acqueſts, as *a Prieſt upon his throne*, or erecting a Goſpel *Kingdom* as a Redeemer of loſt man; which the Goſpel Diſpenſation is generally called, as if on purpoſe to ſecure the Goſpel Law. *Mat.* iv. 23. 1 *Cor.* xv. 24. Search carefully, whether the Spirit of God hath wrought in you the Conditions of the benefits of the Goſpel-Covenant. SERM. II.

THESE are *neceſſary* to your actual obtaining of any benefit promiſed to them reſpectively; and you expect thoſe benefits *without* God's Promiſe, yea, *againſt* God's Word, if you neglect to act the Grace the Promiſe is made to. On the other hand, you diſtruſt God's Promiſe, in not aſſuredly expecting the Benefit for Chriſt's ſake, when you have the Graces to which the Promiſe is made. The Goſpel doth not deceive us, when it encourageth to Duty by benefits; as when it ſaith, *Bleſſed are they that do his commandments, that they may have Right to the tree of life: If thou confeſs with thy mouth, and believe in thine heart, thou ſhalt be ſaved: Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.* Will Chriſt fail to do what his mouth hath uttered, though he diſplay his Grace in giving us that aſſurance upon ſuch Duties? Chriſt's righteouſneſs will be applied in making good every Goſpel-Promiſe: Rev. xxii. 14. Rom. x. 9. Rev. ii. 10.

SERM. II. How unſavoury then is it for any one to ſay, that *all your obedience avails no more to juſtify you, than your worſt Sins?* It is true, no Duty is our Righteouſneſs for which we are juſtified; but it is as true, that the obedience and great duty of *Faith* ſignifies more to our Juſtification, than that worſt Sin of *unbelief*: For Chriſt's righteouſneſs will never be applied to us for our Juſtification, unleſs we believe; and if we believe, we ſhall certainly be juſtified by Chriſt's righteouſneſs. Oh Sirs! Woe to us at the laſt Day if we are found to have nothing but the vileſt Sins, and no Graces or Duties; for then will God judge us by the Goſpel, whether we are believers or unbelievers, obedient or diſobedient to the Goſpel, godly or wicked, precious or vile. (See *Rom.* ii. 6, to 13.) And, *Be not deceived; God is not mocked, but whatſoever a man ſoweth, that ſhall he alſo reap. We may have boldneſs in the day of Judgment, becauſe as he is, ſo are we in this world. Little children, let no man deceive you: He that doth righteouſneſs is righteous.* Whatever Chriſt, by his Goſpel, promiſeth upon any Duty, we follow after that, in being earneſt with God in Chriſt for ability to do that Duty; and if by Grace we are enabled thereto, we may rejoice in God's Truth, and be ſure that in the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, he will perform that Promiſe to us; whereas if we neglect the Duty, we wickedly preſume

Gal. vi. 7.

1 Joh. iv. 17.

1 Joh. iii. 7.

to

to expect that Bleſſing, and abuſe and pro- SERM.
phane the Name of Chriſt and his Right- II.
eouſneſs, in thinking we may have that
Bleſſing by his Righteouſneſs, though we impenitently perſiſt in our neglects. The Reaſon is this, Chriſt in his Goſpel-promiſes hath declared, how the effects of his Righteouſneſs ſhall be diſpenſed to men, and deſigneth thereby to govern our hopes and fears now, and to judge us at the laſt Day. I ſhould now inſiſt,

SECONDLY, ON the other ſenſe, wherein we are *made righteous by Chriſt's obedience*; which is, by the Merits and Spirit of Chriſt to be *made obedient to the Goſpel*, at leaſt in thoſe things which Chriſt hath graciouſly appointed to be the *Conditions* of our actual enjoyment of ſaving benefits, as the effects of his ſole righteouſneſs. But I have already declared what may inform you ſomewhat thereof; nor have I room to purſue it: Only let me hint,

1. THAT Faith, Repentance, Holineſs, *&c.* are a *real righteouſneſs*. They are oft called ſo by the Holy Ghoſt, and men are denominated *righteous* thereby: Nay, theſe are called *righteouſneſs*, and men ſaid to be *righteous* with reſpect to theſe, abundantly oftner, than on the account of the imputed Righteouſneſs of

SERM. II.

Chriſt. 1 *John* iii. 7. 1 *Tim.* i. 9. 1 *Pet.* iv. 18. *Rom.* vi. 13, 16, &c.

2. ALL our *inherent righteouſneſs* is owing to Chriſt's obedience; and to effect it, was one of the principal deſigns of Redemption. The Impunity of Sinners is a lower deſign, than the reſtoration of the Divine Image to depraved man. *Tit.* ii. 14. *Eph.* iv. 20,---24. He purchaſed our Graces, and mainly attends to the mortifying of Sin, and perfecting the Holineſs of his Members; and will at laſt *preſent them to the Father*, fit for his delight. *Eph.* v. 27.

3. THE Oeconomy of Redemption is ſuch, that the *Holy Ghoſt* is to have a great hand in ſaving Sinners; eſpecially in applying Chriſt's righteouſneſs to men, and communicating the effects thereof. Hence it is ſaid, that we *are juſtified in the name of the Lord Jeſus, and by the Spirit of our God.* The Father gives the Redeemer, the Redeemer pays the price of Redemption, the Holy Spirit applies the price. The Father gives his Son to obey for righteouſneſs, the Son by obeying acquireth the righteouſneſs, the Spirit quickens and works Faith in the Sinner, whereby he becomes the perſon *juſtified by his righteouſneſs*, according to the Goſpel-rule of its application; which Rule was jointly enacted by Father, Son, and Spirit. It is as dangerous to exclude the Holy Ghoſt from an Effi-

1 Cor. vi. 11.

Efficiency in *framing* Sinners for the participating of blessings in Christ's right, as it is to exclude Christ from the sole Impetration. SERM. II.

MANY little think, what a dishonour and offence they are to the Holy Ghost, in denying an authoritative Connection between Duties and Benefits, and allowing him no hand in making them the Objects to whom Gospel-benefits are appropriated by its Sanction. The Language of such to the Spirit is, "We are, without any "operation of thine on us, the persons en- "titled to all Benefits: Christ hath not "only a Right to all these Blessings, but "we also are fully and constantly in- "vested in that Right, without any depen- "dance on thee, or obligation to thee: "Though we own, thou workest some of "those things, *after* we have a full Right "to them, and *because* we have that full "Right; yet we are at no time indebted "to thee, for any ways rendring us the "persons to whom that Right is applied "or belongs; the vilest wretch in Hell "oweth thee as much Thanks on that ac- "count." I would tremble to hold a Principle, whereof this is the native Language; when I see, that though the Promises are made in Christ's Right, and the Benefits contained in them are his Purchase; yet, as they require Conditions in such as shall be partakers of Christ's Right to those Benefits,

SERM. II. nefits, to the Glory of the Son, and of the Father who gave his Son; ſo there is a wiſe contrivance for the Honour of the Holy Ghoſt alſo, as it is he who enableth men to perform thoſe Conditions, for a Goſpel-Intereſt in thoſe Benefits.

A RE-

A REPLY TO Mr. *Mather*'s Poſtſcript.

IN this Reply I ſhall conſider, *Firſt*, The Errors Mr. *Mather* charges me with: *Secondly*, What he offers in Defence of his own: And then ſhall add, *Thirdly*, Some Exceptions to ſome other paſſages in his Book.

SECT. I.

FIRST, *I ſhall conſider the Errors Mr.* Mather *charges me with.*

THESE Errors he loads with no lighter Epithets than *damning* and *blaſphemous*; Terms agreeable to his long known temper and charity. He introduces his charge with an *Ecce*, This is he, *he is the man*. Would he infer, that I am the *only man?* No, the body of Divines, except *Antinomians*, af-

SECT. I.

firm as I do; and in his *Preface* it is his moan, the number is ſo great. Is it, that I am the man that *eminently* defend theſe? Alas, I can ſhew him Volumes of the dead; and many are yet alive, whoſe defence of my Poſitions is ſo nervous, as renders mine truly inconſiderable, and his oppoſition thereto contemptible. Sure then, it is either to leave *a mark*, that his factious deſign may more ſucceed; or to point me out as the perſon deſigned by him in his Sermons, (*pag.* 22, 64.) in words indeed too blunt for a man of his own ſagacity to need another comment. Yet after all his labour to make *the man ſure*, he hath aſſigned the Charge *ſo falſely*, that an ingenuous Reader will ſooner charge *him* for a *baſe Trick* in his inſinuations, than *me* as the Patron of the opinions he would aſcribe to me.

Poſtſcript, *pag.* 72. I Charge. *He is one that makes Union to Chriſt, our having this Righteouſneſs upon us, and our being juſtified by it, to be given us in way of Reward of ſomething done by us.*

Repl. [1.] MY words (which he refers to here and *pag.* 46.) are theſe: "Goſpel-"benefits are no Reward *of debt*, and yet "they are given in *a way* of Reward: The "benefits are *given*, not *for* our Faith, yet "upon believing; not *upon it* as a *meriting* "conſideration, yet upon it as that the "*preſence* whereof is made neceſſary *by the* "*Goſpel*,

" *Goſpel*, this having *required* Faith, and confined the benefit to him that believes. " If a man ſays, I'll give you a thouſand " pounds if you will come to my houſe " and fetch it; is it not a free Gift, though " the poor man muſt come if he will have " it? and the Giver is yet bound by his " Promiſe to give it if he come, and not " bound to give it if he refuſe to come." *Defence of Goſpel-Truth*, pag. 362, 363.

SECT. I.

THESE are my very words which he pretends to mention, and no where in my Books can he find the leaſt ſhadow for more. You ſee, (1.) I mention only *Goſpel-benefits*, and not Union with Chriſt or Juſtification. (2.) It is *Faith only* I mention, and not *ſomething done by us*, by which he would inſinuate, that other good Works are meant. (3.) I ſay, it's *upon* believing, and not *for* Faith; upon it, not as a *meriting* Conſideration; but upon it, as that the *preſence* whereof is made neceſſary by the Goſpel. Doth not this ſound lower, than his *Reward of ſomething* done by us? *Upon it* as a thing *preſent*, and *of it* as a thing *meriting*, are very different. (4.) The occaſion of my uſing theſe words was this; to prove, that God by the Goſpel enjoins Faith as a condition of our having thoſe good things, which yet he freely gives; and that Chriſt ſhews his governing Authority in his diſplays of Grace, and excites to Duties by motives from benefits freely given;

SECT. I. given; and that Goſpel-conditions have no Merit of *condignity* or *congruity*. And, (5.) I laid the *umbrage* of the way of Reward, wholly on the Goſpel-promiſe, and not upon the leaſt Dignity of the act done. God, who is our Ruler, commands Faith, and promiſeth, as a motive to Faith, the benefits purchaſed by Chriſt as good things. Here's the whole of this *damning Error*, as far as he could juſtly call it mine. And by this time you'll diſcern as little Danger to me by my opinion, as to him by his falſe and malicious attempt to expoſe my Miniſtry and Perſon, not to ſay Truth itſelf; yea, and the generality of Miniſters and Chriſtians, who will not ſtoop to him as a Dictator. But,

[2.] I SHALL deſcend into the merit of the Cauſe truly ſtated, which is reſolved into two Queſtions.

1 Queſt. *When may a Benefit be ſaid to be given in a way of Reward, when yet it is not in a way of debt or merit, or a Reward for the thing done?*

Anſ. A THING is thus given in *a way* of Reward, when a Benefit is given in a way of Encouragement of ſomething required, yea, or deſired to be done, however ſmall or unvaluable the thing done is, or however great the benefit is. If you ſay to your Child, "If you'll make a Bow and "thank me, I'll give you ſuch an Eſtate:" When you give him ſuch an Eſtate upon his ſo

ſo bowing and thanking, you do give it him in a way of Reward: It's *a Gift*, becauſe that Bow and thanks *deſerve not* that Eſtate; yet it's given in *a way* of Reward, ſince you promiſed it in a way of Encouragement to his Bow and thanks. Indeed all Goſpel-conditions are but a mere receiving of the benefits. SECT. I.

2 Queſt. *Whether God doth give Goſpel-benefits in a way of Encouragement to our performing of any Goſpel-duties?*

Anſ. CAN any one read the Bible, and not ceaſe to doubt, that the Scope of it were vain in its propoſals and promiſes, if the thing be otherwiſe? For,

1. ARE not the Promiſes of the Goſpel *motives* to duty? When it is ſaid, *Repent and be converted, that your Sins may be blotted out*; and, *Come unto me, and I will give you reſt*; Is the blotting out Sins no encouragement to Repentance? and is Reſt no exciting motive to a weary Soul's coming to Chriſt? Acts iii. 19. Mat. xi. 28.

2. Is it a Diſhonour to Chriſt, to perform his Promiſe, in the way, and to the full ends, that he makes that Promiſe? Doth he uſe the benefit as a *motive*, but not diſpenſe it a way ſhewing his *Approbation* of the duty whereto the motive was influential? Eſpecially, when his actual performance of his Promiſe to ſome, is an encouragement to all others, as it's a ratification of his word. So it is urged, *That ye be not*

ſlothful,

SECT. I. *ſlothful, but followers of them, who through Faith and Patience inherit the Promiſes.* He would have us to this day be diligent, believing, and patient: And what is his motive? Even this; that others were ſo, and upon being ſo do now in Heaven inherit the promiſed good; *through Faith and Patience* they inherit.

Heb. vi. 12.

3. DOTH not God frequently expreſs *his regard* to the duty performed, as what he encourageth and ſhews his *Approbation* of, in applying the benefit he promiſed hereupon. *When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedneſs, &c. becauſe he conſidereth and turneth away from all his tranſgreſſions that he hath committed, he ſhall ſurely live, he ſhall not die.* Again, *Come ye bleſſed, &c. For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat; &c.* And, *Well done, good and faithful Servant; thou haſt been faithful over a few things, I will make thee Ruler over many things.*

Ezek. xviii 27, 28. Mat. xxv. 34, 35. Ver. 23.

4. How oft are Goſpel-benefits called *a Reward* in Scripture? *Whatſoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord; knowing that of the Lord ye ſhall receive the reward of the inheritance; for* (or *becauſe,* γαρ,) *you ſerve the Lord Chriſt.* And, *Let no man beguile you of your reward*; as falling from the Truth would be the way to loſe it. Again, *If any man's work abide, he ſhall receive a reward: And every man ſhall receive his own reward, according to his own labour.*

Col. iii. 23, 24. Col. ii. 18. 1 Cor. iii. 14. Ver. 8.

labour. Nay, we are down right Infidels, and next to Atheiſts who deny *God is*, if we do not *believe that he is a rewarder of them that diligently ſeek him.* SECT. I. Heb. xi. 6.

5. THE *humbleſt* Saints, that abhorred Merit moſt, have been *encouraged* to their duty by the promiſed benefit, and expected to receive it *in this way* of Reward that I contend for. *Let us not be weary in well-doing; for in due ſeaſon we ſhall reap, if we faint not.* Yea, *If I do this thing willingly, I have a reward: And this I do for the Goſpel's ſake, that I may be partaker thereof with you: So run, that ye may obtain:* We *ſtrive to obtain an incorruptible Crown; I therefore ſo run, not as uncertainly*, &c. Gal. vi. 9. 1 Cor. ix. 17, 23, & ſeq.

6. How oft are Chriſtians called *worthy* of the benefits, (in a Goſpel-ſenſe,) and that with reſpect to their Graces and Perſeverance? *They which were bidden, were not worthy*, becauſe they rejected Chriſt. And when Chriſt ſent forth his Diſciples, he tells them, *If the houſe be worthy, let your peace come upon it*; that is, on thoſe who would accept their meſſage: In which reſpect the refuſers of Chriſt are called *unworthy of everlaſting life*, though *Forgiveneſs* had been *tendered* to them. So alſo, *Thou haſt a few Names, which have not defiled their garments; and they ſhall walk with me in white, for they are worthy: He that overcometh, the ſame ſhall be clothed in white raiment, and I will not blot out his name* Mat. xxii. 8. Mat. x. 13. Acts xiii. 38, 46. Rev. iii. 4, 5.

SECT. I. *name out of the book of life, but I will confeſs his name before my Father, and before his Angels.* A perſevering freedom from Pollution in doctrine and practice, is the very thing that the Promiſe refers to, in the perſons thus encouraged; for the *fifth verſe* prevents Mr. *Mather*'s perverting of the *fourth*. For though Chriſt's righteouſneſs is ſuppoſed to this, and all other Promiſes, and the reward is in his Right; yet it is to *thoſe that overcome*, and not to others: And tho' it is on Chriſt's account, they that are *faithful* are eſteemed *worthy*; yet it is the *faithful*, and not the unfaithful, that in him are ſo eſteemed *worthy*.

7. I HAVE oft thought what theſe men think of Chriſt, that he alone can give nothing to his Followers in a way of reward, nor propoſe any thing to his Enemies, as an encouraging inducement to become his Diſciples. It ſeems he cannot *outbid* Satan, the World, and the Fleſh, leſt he make his Followers *Merit-mongers*.

8. As ſtrange is it, how they that credit theſe confuſed men, can ever come to any *grounded hopes* or Aſſurance of an intereſt in any Goſpel-benefit. Can they hope without a Promiſe? That is vain. But what is the Promiſe to them, without an Intereſt? No more, than to ſuch as never ſhall enjoy it, which are very many. Then how is it *theirs?* whereby have *they* an intereſt rather than others, ſince God offers

offers the promiſed benefits to thoſe others as well as them? If they ſay, "I am a be- "liever, and thoſe others are not ſo; I *a* "*believer* ſhall have theſe benefits for "Chriſt's ſake, but thoſe others ſhall not, "*becauſe* they are ſtill unbelievers; and "ſo Chriſt's righteouſneſs ſhall not be ap- "plied to them, for an intereſt in theſe be- "nefits according to theſe Promiſes:" Alas, hereby they fall into the *Error* which Mr. *Mather* calls *damnable*; they expect the benefit in a way of Reward, upon being believers rather than unbelievers. SECT. I.

9. THE *Miniſtry* is by theſe wild notions reduced to a dead unapt thing. Take away that Encouragement to converſion and godly perſeverance, reſulting from the Benefit promiſed thereto, and the Dangers they eſcape thereby; and who will mind their *telling their Story*, as they call it?

10. NAY, they confound all men in their ſerious Endeavours. They call men to believe in Chriſt; and tell them, (as Mr. *Mather,*) in caſe they do ſo, his Righteouſneſs will be upon them: That ſeems an Encouragement; ſo far well. Ay, but take heed; for if you expect, that upon your believing, God will apply Chriſt's righteouſneſs to you, that is *damnable*, and not conſiſtent with Faith. So, you muſt pray, mourn, and reform: But you *muſt not rejoice in it*, or look for any thing upon it, ſaith Mr. *Mather*, that is *deſtructive*. What

ſhall

SECT. I. ſhall we think then of poor *Paul?* who ſays, *Our rejoicing is this, the teſtimony of our Conſcience, that in ſimplicity and godly ſincerity, we have had our converſation in the world:* And *Paul* brings many under Mr. *Mather*'s damning Sentence, in his ſaying, it is *our rejoicing.* Yet I would chuſe to be in their caſe, above any men's who talk of Faith and Chriſt, if they neglect this. What ſhall people do in this Wood? It is impoſſible to ſerious men, it is injurious to Chriſt and his Promiſes, not to look for that promiſed good, upon doing what he moves us to by his Promiſes. But yet Mr. *Mather* and his Party aſſure, you are damned if you do it. The Spirit ſaith, *In keeping God's commandments there is great reward:* Mr. *Mather* tells you, there is none. The Spirit ſaith, *Bleſſed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life:* Mr. *Mather* ſaith, you are gone if you expect it. Chriſt ſaith, *Watch and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to eſcape all thoſe things that ſhall come to paſs, and to ſtand before the Son of Man:* Mr. *Mather* tells you, he thinks it inconſiſtent with Faith to do ſo.

2 Cor. i. 12.

Pſal. xix. 11.

Rev. xxii. 14.

Luk. xxi. 36.

II. THEY effectually ſtrike at Chriſt's *Government*, in one of the principal Means he hath pitched on to adminiſter it by in our preſent ſtate. For with them it is *damnable* to be excited to Duty, by hope of any good upon obedience, or by fear of miſſing that

that good if we obey not: And ſo in truth Promiſes and Threats are nullities, as to God's Government. Hence Mr. *Mather* reſolves all the Reaſons of obedience, into the Motives of what God hath done for us. *Pag.* 70. And indeed, they *are* motives; but they are not the *only* motives, nor the *chief* motives, that God makes uſe of; nor even what are *fitteſt* to impreſs mankind; yea, or Chriſtians, whilſt they be ſo imperfect and encompaſſed with Snares: We ſee, they reſtrain not from wrath, malice, faction, *&c.* in too many. How dare men ſay, It is *damning* to ſubmit to ſuch Arguments, which God ſo often uſeth, from future Rewards and Puniſhments; becauſe he ſometimes moves us, from paſt Privileges, or preſent Decencies? Yea, though you ſhould add the authority of the Precepts, whilſt you diveſt them of all Promiſes and Threatnings, to invigorate men's compliances therewith; we ſay, *Fruſtra eſt præcipere, quod impune poteſt negligi.* Chriſt ſaith, *If ye know theſe things, happy are ye if ye do them.* And, *He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the Word that I have ſpoken, that ſhall judge him.* And again, *Be not deceived; God is not mocked; what a man ſoweth, that ſhall he reap: For he that ſoweth to the Fleſh, ſhall of the Fleſh reap corruption; but he that ſoweth to the Spirit, ſhall of the Spirit reap life everlaſting.* I might

SECT. I.

Joh. xiii. 17. Joh. xii. 48. Gal. vi. 7, 8.

SECT. I.

might tranſcribe the greateſt part of the Bible to prove this.

12. THEY dreadfully *contradict themſelves* in all the profitable Sermons they preach. Mr. *Mather* ſaith, It is a *damnable Error* in me, to ſay, that God gives any Benefit in a way of Reward or Encouragement *upon believing*; though it be not as a Debt, or as if Faith merited ought; yea, and it is in and for Chriſt's righteouſneſs that it is given. Yet hear what he ſays himſelf, *pag.* 68. *Oh get Faith, ſee that you believe; for in this way it will come to paſs, that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt ſhall be upon you.* If a man ſhould aſk him, Doth God command me to believe? He will ſay, Yes. *Qu.* But doth God by you perſuade me to believe, by this argument, That Chriſt's righteouſneſs ſhall be upon me? *Anſ.* Yes ſure, or it is a mere deluſion. *Qu.* Well, but ſhall I have it upon my believing? *Anſ.* Yes, *it is in this way.* *Qu.* But will it be *upon me* if I believe not? *Anſ.* No, I have told you, *pag.* 66. *Your Souls ſhall go down into Hell.* If then it be aſked, "Do you intend, that I may "tell my own backward heart, If thou "wilt believe, thou ſhalt have an Intereſt "in this bleſſed Righteouſneſs; and ſo "urge the worth of this, and the neceſſity "of believing, upon my Soul?" I ſuppoſe, Mr. *Mather* muſt here ſuſpend. But if I aſk, "May I expect aſſuredly, when "I am

" I am through Grace enabled to believe, SECT. " that upon this God will put the Right- I. " eouſneſs of Chriſt upon me, and make " good the word wherein he cauſed me " to hope, *viz.* That if I did believe, the " Righteouſneſs of Chriſt ſhould be upon " me?" Here Mr. *Mather* by his Principle muſt cry out, O No, this is to follow *a Soul-deſtroying Error, if there be any in the world.* Pag. 46. Should it be ſaid, " But, Sir, I will not plead my Faith as " any Merit, but only plead the Promiſe " God is pleaſed to make to my Faith, and " rely on that word now that I have " Faith." Mr. *Mather* will tell me, Yet that is *damnable*, for then it comes *in a way of Reward.* And ſhould I aſk again, " If that be damnable, pray why did you " uſe this Motive in the name of Chriſt to " perſuade me to believe? How could it " be a motive to Faith, if I was not to " expect it upon believing? Or if I was " to expect it *before* I believed, in caſe " that I would believe, Why may not I " expect it, now that I do believe?" I know not what Anſwer Mr. *Mather* will make, unleſs, (1.) It is ſomething *done by man:* Or, (2.) God will be ſtill *at liberty* to perform, or not perform, the Benefit, though he did promiſe it: Or, (3.) He will not perform it *in the way* he promiſed it; that is, He promiſed it as an Encouragement to you if you would believe, but he

SECT. I. will not accompliſh it as an Encouragement now that you do believe, nor ſeem ſo much to approve of your Faith. The firſt were *ſilly*; becauſe it was, *a man* was perſuaded to do this, even to believe: For I hope, it is a human act, though by the Spirit's power. The ſecond is, to *impeach the truth* of God's word. The third is, a *weak Foppery*; as if it were a diſhonour to God to give the Benefit, *in the way* he choſe to uſe it, as a motive to the Duty; eſpecially when (as Mr. *Mather* owneth,) *it is by the Goſpel-word that God puts this righteouſneſs on us*; which is the very ſame Word whereby he urgeth this Benefit, as a motive to man's believing. If I again aſk, "Why Mr. *Mather* would by this Motive, "thus perſuade Sinners to believe?" He would, I hope, ſay, This is the way God hath ordained to convert them to the Faith. "But why dare he preach thus, "when it implies what he calls *a damning* "*Error*, or elſe it is a mere mockery?" I'll anſwer for him, He had a mind to venture a contradiction, rather than be wholly uſeleſs to thoſe people, whom he deſigned to frighten from the Miniſtry of others as damnable, that he and his Party might be more conſiderable.

READER, would'ſt thou know whence comes this Confuſion? I'll tell thee, It is, becauſe they conſider not, (1.) That though the Goſpel be not *a Law*, wherein governing

ing Juſtice diſplays itſelf in the adjuſtment of benefits to the duty; yet therein there is a governing Authority in a way of Grace, ſuitable to the State of men, in the diſpenſing of the fruits of Chriſt's death. (2.) That a Reward *of Grace* is quite another thing, than a Reward *of Debt*. (3.) That all Goſpel-benefits are given *in Chriſt's right*, and are the effects of his Righteouſneſs applied to all that partake of them. (4.) That all Goſpel-Precepts and Promiſes do authoritatively *appoint* and *deſcribe* the perſons, that are partakers of benefits, for the ſake of Chriſt's righteouſneſs, but not their own; and do not put men on purchaſing theſe benefits. (5.) Yet theſe do fully *diſtinguiſh* them that ſhall partake of the benefits, from others that ſhall not partake of them. The Goſpel doth hereby fix a certain Rule of Judgment, and doth infallibly direct men's hopes, fears, and expectations: Alſo it governs men's endeavours after Graces and Duties, as the certain Means, on our part, of coming at the reſpective Benefits, graciouſly promiſed in and by Chriſt, to or upon thoſe Graces or Duties. But theſe things I have before largely inſiſted on. This *damning Error* comes to no more at laſt than this, The Goſpel-Covenant is *conditional*, not as to the firſt Grace, but as to the ſubſequent Benefits; and ſo, that God requires us to believe and repent, that we may eſcape the

SECT. I.

SECT. I. Wrath of God; and that there are Promiſes made to Graces: All which the *Aſſembly of Divines* do in plain words aſſert. How many therefore are under Mr. *Mather*'s condemnation? Nay, it is well, if he himſelf was innocent, when he prefaced Mr. *Flavel*'s book, called, *The Blow at the Root*; for there all that I aſſert in this Point is affirmed. Again, he ſays of me,

Pag. 72. II Charge. *He is the man, that makes the State of Believers to be undecided, and in ſuſpenſe during this life.* This is my Second *damning Error*.

Repl. [1.] HE is very unfair in wording this: For who would not infer, either, (1.) That I affirm, that all true Believers are not in a ſtate of Salvation. Or, (2.) That an Elect Perſon, who is brought to believe ſavingly, may apoſtatize, and eternally periſh. Or, (3.) That a Believer, during this life, may not be aſſured of his eternal happineſs. But he knows in his conſcience, that I do often, in the plaineſt words, aſſert the contrary to each of theſe. Take a few Inſtances out of my Book: *Goſpel-Truth ſtated*, pag. 114, 115. I affirm, "that we are juſtified the ſame moment as "we truly believe in Chriſt, and the "bleſſing is *not ſuſpended* for any time "longer: And an Elect perſon once juſ-"tified, *ſhall* by Chriſt's care, *be kept* in "a juſtified ſtate." I affirm, *pag.* 82.

"that

" that Aſſurance is attainable in this life, as SECT. " the effect of Faith." I affirm, *pag.* 137. I. " that the eſſential bleſſings of the Goſpel, " become the inheritance of a believer, *as* " *ſoon* as he is turned to Chriſt: And that " a penitent believer ſhall be ſaved, *if he* " *die before* he hath time for *further* obe- " dience." Again, *pag.* 151. " Do not " ſay, the Elect believer *will not* fall away: " *I think the ſame*; but yet, Is it the leſs " true, that even *he* ſhall periſh, if he " fall away? Nay, doth not God by theſe " threats, contribute to keep him from " Apoſtacy?" See *Defence*, pag. 318.

[2.] I WILL give thee the ground upon which he wordeth this Charge. I ſaid, *pag.* 61, 62. " The reaſon why I uſe the " word *Condition*, is, becauſe it beſt ſuits " with man's relation to God, in his pre- " ſent dealings with us, as *Subjects in* " *trial for eternity*." And *pag.* 148. " How " unſuitable is it to the preſent ſtate of " mankind, that Chriſt ſhould govern us " without promiſes and threatnings? He " is a King, and we are his Subjects: " And we are, 1. Subjects *in a ſtate of tri-* " *al for another world*; and, 2. We have " great remains of Sin within us, and " temptations without us." Theſe are the places, that give him the greateſt umbrage: Now where is it ſaid here, that a Believer's caſe is *undecided?*

[3.] LET us briefly examine, where the very

SECT. I. very true Difference between him and me conſiſts; for certainly there is one, though he thinks it the beſt defence of his own opinion, to miſrepreſent mine, or elſe he had gained little by calling it *damning*. The *Difference is not*, 1. Whether all true Believers are in a ſtate of ſalvation. 2. Whether they ſhall perſevere. 3. Whether it be by the influences of Chriſt, through the Spirit, that they do perſevere. Nor, 4. Whether the Influences of the Spirit and Perſeverance, and the Certainty of their Salvation thereupon, be the effects of Chriſt's righteouſneſs, and purchaſed by his obedience. All theſe I affirm. But the *real Difference is*, (1.) Whether God require Believers to *perſevere* in Faith and Holineſs, as *the means* of their continuing in a ſtate of ſalvation? (2.) Whether it be a *blameably legal Fear*, to be ſolicitouſly cautious in reſiſting temptations, and ſtriving in Chriſt's ſtrength to perſevere, leſt we eternally periſh? And, (3.) Whether if a man have once believed, yet, *if he ſhould fall* under the reigning dominion of Sin and Corruption, he ought to *ſuſpect* that he is not in a ſtate of ſalvation? Theſe three I affirm, and Mr. *Mather* denies; or I can make nothing of his words, which thou muſt join together. *Pag.* 50. "If thou "*haſt* indeed believed with the Faith of "the operation of God, and thy *Con-* "*ſcience know it*, thou mayeſt then con-

"clude

" clude aſſuredly, That whatever thy Sins SECT.
" have been, or *whatever* thy defects and I.
" corruptions *now be*, yet this righteouſ-
" neſs of God is upon thee, thou *haſt it*,
" and *doſt ſtand* in it." But let it be obſerved, The Faith is an act paſt; the Concluſion is at preſent, *whatever a man's corruptions now be*; the only evidence of the paſt Faith is the *knowledge of Conſcience*, which is not infallible. And by the way I can prove, That by his opinion, as that firſt act is before Regeneration, ſo no other, or after-act of Faith, is neceſſary to continue our juſtified ſtate. Again, *pag.* 63. he expoſeth ſuch, " as hold that we *ſtand in*
" *it* [this Righteouſneſs] *by our own Faith.*" And *pag.* 64. " their continuance in obe-
" dience, and the *not failing of their Faith*,
" is one of the Privileges of their ſtate, and
" the effect or fruit of their having this
" Righteouſneſs of Chriſt upon them, and
" *not the means* or *cauſe* thereof." You ſee, the *not failing of Faith*, is not ſo much as *the means* of our continuing to have this Righteouſneſs on us; for of its *firſt being on us*, he makes Faith *a cauſe*, *pag.* 51, 52. I need not ſhew, how oft he calls *all Fears* about this perſeverance in our ſtate *legal.*

I HAVE not time to argue theſe, therefore ſhall only touch on each.

(1.) GOD doth require Believers to *perſevere* in Faith and Holineſs, as *a means* of

SECT. I.

of their continuance in a ſtate of ſalvation. Thus it is ſaid, *Becauſe of unbelief they were broken off, and thou ſtandeſt by Faith; be not high-minded, but fear:—Towards thee, goodneſs, if thou continue in his goodneſs; otherwiſe thou ſhalt be cut off.* And ſo again, *By Faith ye ſtand.* And how conditionally is it propoſed by the Apoſtle? *You hath he reconciled, to preſent you holy and unblameable in his ſight; if ye continue in the Faith, and be not moved away from the hope of the Goſpel:* Where our unreproveableneſs and reconciliation in the body of Chriſt's fleſh through death, as to continuance, is ſtated on this, *If ye continue in the Faith.* And elſewhere it is ſaid, *Now the juſt ſhall live by Faith; but if any man draw back, my Soul ſhall have no pleaſure in him: But we are not of them that draw back to perdition; but of them that believe, to the ſaving of the ſoul.* So that it is by Faith we live; and this believing is to ſalvation, as drawing back is to perdition. How many are the promiſes of ſalvation to Perſeverance, and Threatnings of death againſt Apoſtacy; and theſe uttered to Believers? Yea, and are urged as a great *means* of their perſeverance, which divine wiſdom hath appointed. Obj. *Chriſt's righteouſneſs upon us keeps our Faith.* *Anſ.* And yet, *keeping our Faith through God's power* keeps that righteouſneſs upon us *to ſalvation.* And know, that Chriſt's righteouſneſs

Rom. xi. 20, 22.

2 Cor. i. 24.

Col. i. 22, 23.

Heb. x. 38, 39.

1 Pet. i. 5.

eouſneſs is applied, in correſpondence with the Goſpel-rule: It is not upon the Apoſtate to give him a right to ſalvation, but upon the perſevering Believer: It is on the Believer for his preſent right, but it is in Chriſt for to be ſtill applied to the perſevering Believer for his continued right. Obj. *The Believer will not fall away.* *Anſ.* It is not *naturally* impoſſible, but it's *by Grace* that he *ſhall not* fall away. But then, God's helps and means muſt be uſed by him, of which theſe *Cautions* are not the leaſt; and the connexion between Apoſtacy, and the loſs of ſalvation, is never the leſs true, and ſo Mr. *Mather*'s Principle never the leſs falſe; *for if* ever *he draw back, my Soul ſhall have no pleaſure in him.* And truly you may as well infer, that Faith is not neceſſary to our Juſtification at firſt, as that Perſeverance is not neceſſary to our continuing ſo. For as it was ſure of the Elect, even before they believed, that they ſhould be juſtified; ſo it is ſure of the Believer, before he perſevere, that he ſhall be ſaved: But yet, if Faith be neceſſary to the firſt, ſo Perſeverance by as expreſs a teſtimony is neceſſary to the laſt.

SECT. I.

(2.) IT is not *blameably legal Fear*, for Believers to be ſolicitouſly cautious in reſiſting temptations, and ſtriving in Chriſt's ſtrength to perſevere, and this leſt they eternally periſh. *Hold faſt that which thou haſt, that no man take thy crown,* was a fit means Rev. iii. 11.

SECT. I. means to beget Care in holding faſt. And the Apoſtle gives it as a Caution, in which he comprehends himſelf; *Let us fear, leſt a Promiſe being left us, any of us ſhould ſeem to come ſhort of it:* Any appearing challenge from within themſelves was matter of Fear, for on Chriſt's part there's no ſuſpicion. Again, it's a divine Charge, *Work out your own ſalvation with fear and trembling*; not only *begin it* ſo, but ſo *work it out.* Nay, in no ſpan of time on this ſide the grave is the beſt Saint exempted: *Paſs the time of your ſojourning here in fear*; and the reaſon is, *If you call upon the Father, who, without reſpect of perſons, judgeth according to every man's work.* Theſe men now tell us, There is no judicial Proceſs of Believers, no Judgment by a Goſpel-rule: It will not be aſked you, what Sin you have committed or forſaken, what Duty you have omitted, or Good you have done; but, are you in Chriſt? As if theſe were of no uſe to determine whether we are in Chriſt truly or no, and as if a Privilege were the proper matter of a judicial Trial. Mr. *Mather* may know, who theſe are. O Chriſtians! Is our Race as yet run, our Fight already fought, or our Dangers paſt? Are we ſtill *in viâ*, or *in termino?*

Heb. iv. 1.

Phil. ii. 12.

1 Pet. i. 17.

(3.) A MAN that hath once believed, *if he ſhould fall* under the reigning power of Sin and Corruption, ought to *ſuſpect* that

that he is not in a ſtate of ſalvation. *If ye live after the fleſh, ye ſhall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye ſhall live*; was a truth directed to all the Saints at *Rome*. And let me tell you, the dominion of Sin is a more ſure evidence, that men are now out of a ſtate of ſalvation; than the knowledge of their Conſciences, that they formerly believed, is of their ever being in a ſtate of ſalvation: For this may be a miſtaken knowledge, but the other is the divine Word. Theſe conceits are obviated by what the Lord declares, *When I ſay to the righteous, he ſhall ſurely live; if he truſt to his own righteouſneſs, and commit iniquity, all his righteouſneſs ſhall not be remembred, but for his iniquity that he hath committed he ſhall die for it*; that is, If becauſe he began to do well, and becauſe he hath done ſo for a time, he ventures to give up himſelf to a courſe of Sin, he ſhall certainly periſh for it. This is the plain Senſe of the place, notwithſtanding Mr. *Mather*'s forced Perverſion of it againſt our expecting any benefit upon performing any duty. The Apoſtle *Paul* thought not himſelf above this Rule, when he ſays, *I keep under my body, leſt when I have preached to others, I myſelf ſhould be a caſt-away*. What a damning Sentence would Mr. *Mather* paſs on *Turretin*, *Perkins*, Mr. *Anthony Burgeſs*, and moſt of our old Divines, who jointly

SECT. I.

Rom. viii. 13.

Ezek. xxxiii. 13.

1 Cor. ix. 27.

SECT. I.

jointly aſſert, That if *David* had died before he had repented of the Murther of *Uriah*, he had been damned? Nay, that comfortable text of the Apoſtle brands his poſition, *There is now no condemnation to them that are in Chriſt, who walk not after the Fleſh, but after the Spirit*; whence it's evident, That if they now *walk after the Fleſh* they ſhall be condemned, at leaſt from its being inconſiſtent with their preſent being in Chriſt, whatever they think of their former believing. I will not retort *damning* on Mr. *Mather*'s opinion; yet to ſuch Souls who credit his notion, That whatever thy corruptions now be, if thy Conſcience know that thou haſt believed formerly, thy Salvation is ſafe; I muſt in pity ſay, thou mayeſt eternally periſh by it. For thou canſt not judge now it was a true ſaving act, but according to the ſentence of Conſcience; and thy Conſcience may be miſtaken: Yea, if thy corruptions now have dominion over thee, and continue ſo, God warns thee, *Let no man deceive you with vain words; for becauſe of theſe things the wrath of God cometh upon the children of diſobedience.* But Mr. *Mather* adds,

Rom. viii. 1.

Eph. v. 6.

Pag. 72. III Charge. *And whether he do not in truth diſown the Imputation of our Sins unto Chriſt, and of his Righteouſneſs unto us, it is like, if he live, the world will ſee more fully; for he hath given ſuch pregnant indications thereof,*

thereof, as do amount to at leaſt juſt cauſe of Jealouſy. SECT. I.

Repl. [1.] Is it come ſo low as a Jealouſy now? when he was one that under his hand affirmed thus of me, "*He teacheth,* that the righteouſneſs of Chriſt *is* "imputed *only* as to effects, with a purchaſe of a conditional grant, *viz.* this "Propoſition, *He that believeth ſhall be* "*ſaved:*" And they cite for it, though in contrary words, *Goſpel-Truth*, pag. 43. where my words are theſe. *I affirm*, "That Chriſt "by his righteouſneſs merited for all the "Elect, that they ſhould in his time and "way be certainly partakers of its ſaving "effects; and *did not only* purchaſe a conditional grant of thoſe effects, *viz.* this "Propoſition, *He that believeth ſhall be* "*ſaved.*" To which I add in the next words, "That *beſides theſe effects being made ours,* "*the very righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed* "*to true believers*, as what was always "undertaken and deſigned for their ſalvation, and is now effectual to their actual "pardon and acceptance to life; yea, is "pleadable by them as their ſecurity, and "is as uſeful to their happineſs, *as if they* "*themſelves had done and ſuffered what* "*Chriſt did.*" Reader, were theſe men duly tender or honeſt, when they pervert words ſo plain, and aſcribe to me what is as directly contrary to my words, as yea and no? They ſay, that I affirmed what I de-

ny,

SECT. I. ny, and that I denied the very thing I affirmed: But the Turn could not be ſerved without theſe methods.

[2.] THE ground of Jealouſy I'll give, and judge you how juſt it is. (1.) I did affirm, "that Chriſt did bear the puniſh-"ment of our Sins;" yea, "that he bare "the *guilt of our Sins*, which is that re-"ſpect of Sin to the threatning of the "Law, whereby there is an obligation to "bear the Puniſhment." But I denied, "that Sin *itſelf*, as to its *filth* and *fault*, "was tranſacted on Chriſt; and that Chriſt "was made and accounted by the Father "*the very tranſgreſſor*, the *adulterer*, and "*blaſphemer*." *Goſpel-Truth*, pag. 10, 11. Here's my Crime, for Mr. *Mather* hath oft preached up the latter. (2.) I affirm as thou ſeeſt, of the *Imputation* of Chriſt's *righteouſneſs*: But my Fault is, that I deny, that God accounts that *we legally died and obeyed*, or that *we made Satisfaction to God*; though I grant, that Chriſt *died for us*, yea, in our place and ſtead.

[3.] I HAVE, through the goodneſs of God, lived to declare in this Book enough to confute his prophecy, and his opinion too; though I think he ſhould pray for a more calm and charitable ſpirit, before he pretend to predictions concerning his brethren. And now,

[4.] WILL he repent of his rigid cenſorious Slander? For I'll here declare, that I aſſent

aſſent to his own words, *pag.* 18. " By *imputed* I mean, *that it* [Chriſt's righ-" teouſneſs] *is looked on by God as belong-" ing to us, in order to our being judicially " dealt with according to the merit thereof.*" This I have oft affirmed, but it's far ſhort of what he elſewhere ſtrains it to. Farther he charges me with ſaying, SECT. I.

IV Charge. *The Son of God was united to an Embrio, which* (he ſays) *is a piece of ignorant Blaſphemy.* Pag. 75.

Repl. My words were, (as above, *pag.* 32.) " Oh for *God-Man* to be at any time " unactive as an *Embrio*, or child in the " womb! for him to be *born of a woman*, " &c." I ſaid not, that the Son of God was *united to an Embrio*; unactive *as an Embrio* is another thing: And I will bring him twice Ten, to oppoſe his two Witneſſes. But had I ſaid it, where is the *Blaſphemy?* when the divine nature, I hope, was united to Chriſt's *dead Body* in the grave, as all grant. And very many ſay, that the divine nature was united to the Fleſh before it was organized or animated; of whom is *Turretin*, who ſays, *Etſi anima infundi non potuit in corpus, niſi jam organizatum*, &c. *non ſequitur* λογον *non potuiſſe carnem ſtatim ſibi unire, cum opus ejus non poſſit aut præſente aut abſente animâ coarctari.* So *Pearſon* alſo, and multitudes, are *Blaſphemers* with this bold man. But Inſtit. Theol. *vol* ii. *pag.* 372.

SECT. I. supposing, (that though the Virgin *conceived* by the power of the Holy Ghost, and went her usual time, and that Christ was like other children, and the *Fœtus* had matter and nourishment ministred thereto by the Virgin, who conceived by the power of the Spirit; yet) that the Divine Person was not united to the Flesh before it was animated: Are not many Physicians so ignorant, as to judge the Soul is united to the body unorganized? and if so, either the human nature of Christ had a separate subsistence from the Divine Person, which is false, or the Divine Person assumed it when the body was unorganized. But it is a theme not fit for me to pursue, who must confess my Ignorance therein in comparison of Mr. *Mather*, who can tell us, how *the human nature of Christ leans on the God-head in the Son, and hath the eternal power of the Deity clasping about it, and holding it in that union.* May not this seraphical, yet very dull Author, call what he pleases in this point *a piece of ignorant blasphemy?* whatever greater Divines, or skilful Physicians, say to the contrary.

Serm. *pag.* 63.

BECAUSE I would wash off all his Dirt at once, I will give you one Charge out of his Book, which he forgets in his *Postscript*, though it hath been their best Tool; *viz.*

Pag. 22. V Charge. *That I lick up* Bellarmin *that*

that Popiſh ſelf-juſticiary's vomit, in my ex-poſition of Phil. iii. 8, 9. SECT. I.

Repl. THIS is as true as the reſt; for when I expounded that text, I plainly affirmed, (1.) That we are juſtified by Chriſt's imputed righteouſneſs only. (2.) That all holineſs compared with winning Chriſt, is to be eſteemed *as dung*. (3.) That the beſt thing in us is *vile*, compared with Chriſt's righteouſneſs. And indeed, if that text ſpeaks only of *Juſtification*, and the Apoſtle deſigns to oppoſe *his own righteouſneſs* to Chriſt's, then his own and ours are as unfit *as dung* to be found in. But, (4.) I then judged, (and ſtill do,) that the Apoſtle there deſigned to proclaim the preferableneſs of *Chriſtianity* to Judaiſm, and what was Phariſaical, yea, or ſelf-invented. And therefore, as he enumerates all the dignities of *Judaiſm*, ſo he aſcribes to Chriſt the whole Glory of his entire redeemed State; ſhewing, that not only his Juſtification, but his Sanctification too, came from and by Chriſt; both which were of a diviner nature, as well as appointment, than what he arrived to while he was a ſtranger to Chriſt: He expected therefore, and preſſed after a *perfection* therein, while he deſpiſed *all things*, all privileges and attainments, which ſtood in competition with Chriſt; yea, and was glad he had *loſt them all* for union with him; a perſeverance in whom, with higher com-

SECT. I. munications from him, was the very main Aim of his life and endeavours. I am ſure, this Senſe beſt agrees with the *context*, and is far enough from *Bellarmin*'s ſenſe; neither want I reaſon ſufficient to prove it, had I room: Yea, my expoſition of that Text is ſo far from militating againſt Juſtification by Chriſt's righteouſneſs, that it proves it ſtrongly.

SECT. II.

SECONDLY, *I ſhall now conſider Mr.* Mather's *Defence of his own Errors.*

HE confines his Defence to two Points; ſaying, *I kept ſilence as to more.* When others read this Book, they will find a greater number, though it ſeems he could not perceive them when he read my Notes: And though he hath left out of his printed Sermons many obnoxious paſſages, yet he will meet with his *Suretiſhip-righteouſneſs*; the Debtor being *as clear as the Surety*; pag. 24. with his limiting ſo far *Chriſt's merit* to his *active obedience*; pag. 15. with his poſition, that all the Graces of the Spirit are *effects of our being juſtified*, and *not at all the means thereof*; pag. 32. that *all our obedience avails no more to our Juſtification, than our worſt Sins*; pag. 71.

71. that, though he aſcribes a *cauſality* to Faith, *the Crown of Glory is due to us in Juſtice*; pag. 12. yea, even *a remunerative Juſtice is exerted to us*; pag. 15. *&c.* SECT. II.

BUT let us take what he thinks moſt concerns him: And of theſe

I. THE *firſt* Point is, That *Chriſt's Incarnation was no part of his Humiliation.* Where, [1.] He grants the Point which ought to be the real Queſtion. And, [2.] He ſets up for his *Chimera* with a falſe State of the Queſtion and its terms.

[1.] HE grants the Point which ought to be the real Queſtion. He tells us, *pag.* 73. "If you take Incarnation *largely*, as "compriſing Chriſt's taking our nature "and the common ſinleſs frailties of it, "together with his being in the form of "a Servant, and made under the Law, "*I know not why it ſhould be denied to be* "*a part of his Humiliation.*"

Repl. WELL, Chriſt's taking our nature is granted by him to be *part* of this large Senſe: And who can fairly exclude the reſt out of the ſubject of this Queſtion, *Was Chriſt's Incarnation part of his Humiliation?* Did not Chriſt aſſume our nature, with theſe frailties, and in the form of a Servant? Is our Queſtion concerning an *Ens rationis?* that is, *Suppoſing* Chriſt had taken our nature, without taking the form of a Servant, which was next to impoſſi-

SECT. II. ble; or without its ſinleſs Frailties, which were then natural to it; and not under the Law, which was the next End of taking it; What would it have been then? that is, If it had been what it never was, nor never would have been, (whatever ſome *Popiſh Schoolmen* talk,) is that to be the *Subject* of this Queſtion? is this meant by *Incarnation?* Whereas, as it indeed *was*, or as Chriſt was incarnate, and the *only way* he was incarnate, Mr. *Mather* grants it was *Humiliation*, and ſo he fairly yields the cauſe,

BUT where will you hold him? In a few lines, he drops *the form of a Servant*, as not ſo proper a part of Chriſt's *Humiliation*, becauſe Chriſt in his *Exaltation* hath ſtill *the form of a Servant:* Well recalled, becauſe ſo ſoon! But it is to get creditable company in his overſight, for he chargeth the Apoſtle with the ſame Slip; *pag.* 73. "Humiliation, &c. which the "Apoſtle calls taking on him *the form of* "*a Servant*, or rather being *made under* "*the Law*; between which there may be "conceived ſome difference, for Chriſt is "ſtill *God's Servant*, &c." It's well, the Apoſtle added this in another place. But what gains our Author by this Halt?

1. EITHER he engageth againſt him, *Phil.* ii. 7. where *the form of a Servant* is part of Chriſt's *Exinanition*; (and note, that the beſt Authors eſteem Chriſt's taking the form

form of a Servant for his very *Incarnation*, and not any humbling Circumſtance conſequential of it:) Or elſe Mr. *Mather* anſwers himſelf, and his poor Argument too; and ſure, that's convictive: For if Chriſt was humbled in taking on him the form of a Servant, though he keeps the form of a Servant in his exalted State; then Chriſt might be humbled in aſſuming our nature, though he keeps that nature in his exalted State. SECT. II.

2. YEA, I think one may follow him to *Gal.* iv. 4. For if there the Apoſtle *more properly* mentions Chriſt's Humiliation, and inſtanceth Chriſt's being *made under the Law*; yet he fails not to join therewith Chriſt's being *made of a woman*, to ſhare in the Humiliation with his being *made under the Law.* It would ſeem, Mr. *Mather* thinks, the Apoſtle had better ſerved his purpoſe, if not written more accurately, had he ſet *made under the Law* in the room of *taking the form of a Servant*, in *Phil.* ii. 7. But it will be no otherwiſe, yet he ſits not down with it: For after all his mending and winding in vain, to confine *all Chriſt's Humiliation* to his being *made under the Law*; he heſitates, and will be halving that too: And therefore tells us, "He is not now "*under the Law*, as he was in the days of "his fleſh." Then, the whole of Chriſt's being *under the Law* is not a part of his Humiliation; it muſt be confined to an

SECT. II. *As he was in the days of his flesh.* And what's all this Toil for? You'll presently see, it's to keep all Humiliation within the compass of *the Curse*; as he had said before, *pag.* 7. "All the while Christ was "in a State of Humiliation, he was *under* "*the Curse*:" A point, which that difficult text *Gal.* iii. 13. will never prove, as to the whole time.

LET us now review, what he hath brought his first State of the Question to, which promised so well *primo intuitu.* We have lost Christ's *taking our nature*, which was never intended; we have lost *the form of a Servant*, as what is still retained in Heaven; we have lost all that's included in being *under the Law*, except as it was in the days of his flesh. And now,

[2.] IT is time to see, what use he'll make of all this, and how he supports his *Chimera* by a further false explaining of the terms of the Question: And this he doth, by confining *Humiliation* to what is far less than it truly is; and making *Incarnation* to be such an abstracted thing, as it never was, nor possibly could be.

1. HUMILIATION is "fulfilling the "Law, either in the Precept, or in the "Curse of it;" *pag.* 75. and before, *pag.* 7. he confined it to *being under the Curse.*

Repl. The Disjunctive may help, otherwise he hath given so hard a Definition of *Humiliation*, by making it convertible with

the

the Curse, that it would sound ill to ascribe it to the Eternal Word, unless on the account of our Flesh already assumed; yea, or so as our Author intends by the Curse. But the best of it is, this is *gratis dictum*; but where is the Proof, that's a thing he seldom mindeth; that *he saith it*, is enough to bring you under his damning Sentence, if you deny assent. But, SECT. II.

(1.) THERE is a very great part of Christ's Humiliation as the Son of God, which is no part of the humbling Curse as upon the Son of Man. His *Exinanition*, or laying aside of his Glory, is Humiliation in the account of the Holy Ghost; and this was true of the Son of God, as to his very assuming our flesh, abstracted from its humbling circumstances, as I have fully proved. Is it strong reasoning then, Because the Humiliation of Christ hath more parts than one; therefore that which is not that one part of it, is no part at all of it?

(2.) CHRIST did assume our nature *in obedience to a Law*, even that of Mediation; to which he had subjected himself as our Sponsor; this also I have proved. And sure, if obedience to the Law of works, as he grants, would render the Incarnation a part of Humiliation; why will not obedience to another Law, especially from him who owed no obedience but for our Redemption, and by his own consent?

(3.) Mr.

SECT. II.

(3.) Mr. *Mather* will hazard his ill-jumbled hypotheſis of *Suretiſhip*, unleſs he'll grant, that ſuppoſing the Son of God would be a Redeemer of man, the very Law of works required his *Incarnation*: If ſo, then Mr. *Mather* hath allowed, that it muſt be *a part of Humiliation* in his own proper Senſe. Yea,

(4.) I KNOW a notion of his that muſt fall; that ſuppoſing the compact between the Father and Son, antecedent to the Incarnation, the Son *ſtood obliged* to aſſume our nature with its frailties; and that, becauſe it was *our nature* whom he was to redeem, and becauſe it was in that State by our Sins, which he had obliged himſelf to expiate. Yea,

(5.) UPON his being thus obliged, millions of Sinners were pardoned and ſaved before his Incarnation; and therefore he ſtood charged with their concerns, ſo as to be obliged to ſatisfy for their Sins, and that in their nature; (for *out of their nature* would not ſerve.) Put theſe two laſt together, and we ſhall come, even with Mr. *Mather*'s own good liking, to our Point, *viz.* That Humiliation doth properly predicate of the Incarnation ſtrictly taken. Yet I ſuſpect it will hardly go down: Why? Becauſe Mr. *Mather* is ſo very fond of the ἀνομια and *filth of Sin* being on Chriſt, that he cannot think Chriſt *humbled* ſooner, or longer, than he can with ſome tolerable decency call

call Chriſt the very murtherer, adulterer, blaſphemer, &c. which he hath too frequently preached; and in his Book, *pag.* 14. he a little waſheth, by ſaying, *He put on the Sinners garments*; and *our Guilt, our Sins*, were upon him: (*Criſpian* phraſes, which for ſome end or other he ſtill likes to conſecrate.) With him the true model is, Chriſt muſt be *as unrighteous* as Sinners, that Sinners may be *as righteous* as Chriſt; and our Saviour cannot be humbled till he be a Sinner, nor Sinners happy till they be Saviours. Here is the *arcanum*, whatever be the pretence. SECT. II.

2. THE next Term he diſſecteth and ſtrictly garbleth, is *Incarnation*; pag. 73. "It is ſtrictly his dwelling in Fleſh, "comprehending under it both the act of "aſſumption, and the relation or union "effected thereby between the human na-"ture ſo aſſumed, and the perſon of the "Son of God."

Repl. IF one ſhould aſk him, How the *dwelling in fleſh* comprehends under it *the act of aſſumption*, which is ſuppoſed to it as much as entring into an houſe, is to a man's abode in it? I know not what Anſwer he will make, unleſs that the Son of God repeats *the act of aſſumption* as long as he dwells therein, by that which he calls *The Divinity claſping the Humanity*, pag. 63. If one ſhould again demand, Why he leaves out all that is proper to *real dwelling*? ſince there

SECT. II. there might be *assumption* and *relation*, though it had ceased the next moment. I judge he must answer, Pardon my improper speaking, in making that the principal thing, which nothing of what I speak saith any thing to. But if he should answer, By *dwelling in flesh* I do intend, Christ's still remaining in our nature, and only suppose to it the act of assumption, and the relation effected thereby: I reply, That this is the grossest Fallacy; for Christ's continuing in our nature, is *remaining Incarnate*, and not formally *Incarnation*; which is the term in the Question. And the design of this Fallacy is, to change the Question for the sake of an argument that he greatly wants; since the Question thereby would be, Is the Son of God's *continuing in our nature*, a part of his Humiliation? And is any so foolish as to say, That this is the same Question, as, Was the Son of God's *Incarnation* a part of his Humiliation? where the term *Incarnation* is the very *assuming our flesh* into relation and union; and is so far from being comprehended in the Son of God's *still dwelling in flesh*, that it is supposed thereto, even as its cause; yea, and doth not so much as connote it, but as he assumed it to dwell in it for ever. Such Juggling it seems is necessary.

BUT the main Enquiry I now come to, *viz.* Whereby was the *act of assumption*? How did the Son of God take our flesh into union

union to his Divine Person? Was this in and by *his Conception?* To this Mr. *Mather* answers, *pag.* 74. "Christ's *Incarnation* "is one thing, his *Conception* another: "By the one he became *man*, by the other "*the Son of man*: The former implies only "his participation of the nature; the "other, together with the nature, the "*manner* and *way* of his partaking there-"of; though still in Christ they did con-"cur and coexist." SECT. II.

Repl. It seems then, being *man*, and being *the Son of man*, differ; and that so far, as humbled and unhumbled: But did not the Son of God become *man* by becoming the Son of man? If so, then he was humbled by becoming *the Son of man*, but again unhumbled by becoming *man*. He saith, *they coexisted*. What, as two separate things? No; he tells you, it's as *a thing*, and the *way and manner* of that Thing therewith But to the loss of his Fancy, he will find, that *the thing* hath its being, by what he calls the *way and manner* of that Thing: For the Son of God's *Incarnation* was by his *conception*, as the means and cause of it; and therefore, if he was humbled by his conception, he was humbled by his Incarnation too; for he became Incarnate by being conceived. He tells us, *They did concur*, as well as coexist in Christ: But what meaneth he? Did Christ's being man, as by *Incarnation*, con-

SECT. II.

concur to make him the Son of man by *conception*? as his being the Son of man by his conception, did concur to make him a man, or Incarnate; that is, he took fleſh as *a man*, that he might be conceived, as much as he took fleſh by being conceived. At laſt finding, upon *a long rolling in his mind*, that if to be *conceived* was to be humbled, the Son of God then muſt be humbled by becoming Incarnate; he leaves this profane Cant, and tries what he can make of granting, "There was an abaſe-"ment *in the manner* of his Conception, "but not *in his being conceived*." But as I think he can never part them, ſo I have elſewhere proved, That his *being conceived* is the greater debaſement; and there was nothing in the *manner* of it debaſing, but as ſuppoſing the thing itſelf was ſo. Alas, what is this or that human circumſtance, compared with God's taking our fleſh? And what are the circumſtances? *Mary*, though no rich woman, was of *David*'s line, a free woman, and a Virgin. Yet let us hear his reaſon, ſince he ſeldom offers any: "The human nature "was really related to *Mary*, as to its "Cauſe, for ſhe conceived him; yet ſhe "was not a Cauſe, either of his Incarna-"tion, or of his Humiliation." Doth he intend, that *Mary* was not the Cauſe of the Son of God's Will to be incarnate, and ſo humbled? That is not the point, and none

none doubt it. But I ask, Was not *Mary* the Cause of the human nature, as it was Christ's human nature? and did it not become his human nature, as he was conceived of her, by the efficiency of the Spirit? Well, therein, and so far, she was the Cause of his *Incarnation*: And if she was not the Cause of his *Humiliation*, pray whence was *the abasement in the manner of his Conception*, which Mr. *Mather* just now affirmed? I dare not pretend to seek out any, lest in naming the word *Embrio*, he should call it *a piece of ignorant blasphemy*. SECT. II.

Mr. *Mather*, after all his superfine Distinctions, of Christ's assuming our nature being *another thing* than his Conception; the *thing*, and the *manner* of the thing, (though that *manner* was a Cause of it;) the *Conception*, and the *being conceived*; being self-conscious that he had offered no arguments fit to proselyte any, his admirers not being able to understand them; and such as could guess at what they did signify, being sure to despise, if not abhor them; he comes down to offer a Proposal from his own choice; *pag.* 75. "For my own part, "I would chuse to refer *Christ's Conception* to the things that made him allied "in blood to us, and so fit to act as our "Surety, rather than to his actual performing the work of Suretiship, as antecedently standing in that relation to us."

Repl. DESIGNETH he by this, to leave others

SECT. II.

others to chuſe for themſelves, without a damning Sentence? That is unlike the height and heat of the man. But what can we make of this Jargon, as connected with what paſt before? Was not *Eve* allied in blood to *Adam*, though ſhe was *not conceived* a daughter of man or woman? And therefore Chriſt might have been *allied* without Conception. Again, was not Chriſt allied in blood to us by his *Incarnation*, which he ſaith is *another thing* than Chriſt's Conception? It ſeems by our Author's words, That his abſtracted *Incarnation* was Chriſt's taking the human nature or fleſh, but not ſpecifically *our* human nature or fleſh: Or was his aſſuming the human nature, as diſtinct from *Conception*, an aſſuming a human Soul not allied to our Souls; as he is allied to us in blood by Conception, and he doth here confine it thereto? Here we meet with another Diſtinction, ſufficient to argue him ſtill a deſigning man, but not a very diſtinct or diſcerning one: Here's a human nature, and yet not a human nature allied to us; a human fleſh and blood, and not a fleſh and blood allied to ours. By Chriſt's *Incarnation* he took *a* human nature, *a* fleſh and blood, not allied to us: By *Conception* he became allied to us in fleſh and blood, and in nature too; unleſs he hath it in his mind, that Chriſt hath not a human Soul allied to ours. Thoſe words alſo are very uncertain,

uncertain, *Antecedently ſtanding in that relation to us.* Doth he mean, that Chriſt was not related to men as their Surety, before his Incarnation? How then were all the Saints ſaved before his coming? Or is it, that the Son of God did not perform any Suretiſhip-act, in aſſuming our nature, or being conceived? If ſo, then he had not undertaken to aſſume our nature before he took it; though all that he did or ſuffered (had it been poſſible,) would not have availed us, unleſs ſo done and ſuffered *in our very nature*: And can you ſuppoſe, he engaged not *that* as a Surety or Sponſor, without which nothing had been payment? Or doth he intend, that Chriſt was not allied to us in blood before his Conception? It is true; and yet as true, That he was allied to us in blood by his very *Incarnation*, as well and as ſoon as by his *Conception*: Chriſt did not aſſume a human nature before nor otherwiſe, than as he was by his Conception allied to us in blood, and Soul too. At laſt we are gotten out of this Labyrinth; made up of nothing but ripe blown Thiſtles. SECT. II.

HIS Authorities, when examined, avail him little. I have but room to examine one, yet he is at the Front of them; *pag.* 74. Dr. *Ames* ſaith, "*Humiliatio eſt, qua* "*ſubditus eſt juſtitiæ Dei, ad illa omnia* "*perficienda*, &c. The Humiliation [of "Chriſt as Mediator] is that whereby he "was *Medull. lib.* i. *cap.* 20. *pag.* 94.

SECT. II. " was ſubject to the Juſtice of God, for " finiſhing all thoſe things which were re- " quired for man's Redemption: *Phil.* ii. 8." Here he confineth *Humiliation* to one part, *viz.* a ſubjection to Juſtice, (not Authority,) and this for *finiſhing* (not beginning) what was neceſſary to the Redemption of man; which by the Text he quotes, refers to his Death or paſſion on the Croſs, of which beſure he was not capable as God. But that he confined *all Chriſt's Humiliation* to this, which excludes his Incarnation, is not evident; for the next words are, " *Hu-* " *miliatio iſta non fuit, &c.* That Humi- " liation was not properly of the Divine " Nature or Perſon, conſidered in them- " ſelves, but of the Mediator God-Man: " Therefore the aſſumption of the hu- " man nature, ſimply and in itſelf con- " ſidered, *(non eſt Humiliationis hujus pars)* " is not a part of this Humiliation." *That* Humiliation, and *of this* Humiliation, do indicate, that he had an eye to ſomewhat elſe that might be called by this name *Humiliation*; at leaſt it doth not prove, that Chriſt's *Incarnation* was *not a part* of any Humiliation of the Son of God, becauſe it was not a part of *this* Humiliation. Dr. *Ames* limits it to this part; Mr. *Mather* concludes againſt any other.

OUR Author at laſt, having bungled ſo at Demonſtration, falls to *ſuſpicion-work*, which I confeſs his Talent renders him much

much more expert in; as if *thinking no Evil*, were no part of Charity; or at leaſt, want of Charity were no challenge to Faith. But what hath his jealous head brought forth, after ſo oft tumbling the word *Conception?* Even this, "his own "doctrine of *Imputation* is loſt, if Chriſt's "Incarnation be a part of his Humiliation." Well, it's a point I never thought of before; and it's a comfort to me, the Goſpel-doctrine of *Imputation* will ſuffer nothing, but be availed thereby: I hope to find much more of Chriſt imputed to me as done for me, than what I was perſonally obliged to do by the Law, or was eſteemed legally to perform; though I own, as well as Mr. *Mather*, that Chriſt *died* in my ſtead; yea, and ſo *obeyed* too, as you'll ſee in this Book. But with him, farewell all Chriſt's Obedience or Humiliation, if we did not legally do and endure all the very ſame: And if ſo, he muſt take his leave of the greateſt part of the price of Redemption, *viz.* the value given to all Chriſt's obedience by the Divine Nature; for I hope, the Law never required that in man's obedience. SECT. II.

BUT ſince he lays ſuch ſtreſs on his point of the *Incarnation* being *no part* of Humiliation, let us appeal to competent Judges. The Apoſtle ſpeaking of *Chriſt Jeſus* ſays, *Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but emptied himſelf of his glory, taking on him the form* Phil. ii. 6, 7, 8.

SECT. II.

of a Servant, being made in the likeneſs of men: And being found in faſhion as a man, he humbled himſelf, and became obedient unto Death, even the death of the Croſs. I have rendered εκενωσε, *emptied himſelf of his glory*, and left out the two *copulatives* which are not in the Original. The main matter is reducible to theſe two points. (1.) Is *emptying himſelf of his glory* any Humiliation? I anſwer, It ſignifies more Humiliation, than εταπεινωσεν, which is rendered *humbled*, *ver.* 8. The word is as much, as *rendering* all *glory* and honour *vain* or *void*; and is ſo uſed, 1 *Cor.* ix. 15. (2.) Is the Son of God's *Incarnation* intended by the Apoſtle, when he ſaith, *he made his glorying void?* It is certainly and eminently ſo. For, 1. The Nominative Caſe to this Verb is confined to the Second Perſon not incarnate, *who being in the form of God*, &c. He, even *he* ſo conſidered, before he was God-Man, *emptied himſelf*, or *made his glorying void* as to manifeſtation. And wherein could this properly be ſo, but in *becoming incarnate?* for whatever debaſement followed after his Incarnation, referred to him as the effect of thus emptying himſelf. And, 2. The whole *ſeventh verſe* is confined to his *Incarnation*, as I have fully proved above. He *emptied himſelf, being made in the likeneſs of men.* And ver. 8. *being found in faſhion as a man*, is that which lets in what followed his Incarnation, though but one eminent

Pag. 27. & ſeq.

nent Inſtance be given. — The *Aſſembly of Divines* declare, "Chriſt *humbled himſelf* "*in his Conception*, in that, being from all "eternity the Son of God, he was pleaſed, "in the fulneſs of time, to *become the Son* "*of Man*, made of a Woman of low Eſtate, "and to be born of her, with divers cir-"cumſtances of more than ordinary abaſe-"ment." To wrigle himſelf out of this which he ſubſcribed, he doth, I ſuppoſe, uſe the former Shifts. —— But to add no more, Dr. *Owen* on the *Hebrews* ſays, "This glorious one *humbled himſelf* into "the form *of a Man*, of a Servant, unto "Death, the death of the Croſs: *Phil.* ii. "5, 6, 7, 8." You ſee his comment on this text. Reader, judge now of the confidence and ſmall tenderneſs of this man, that ſhould have a very peculiar eye to this opinion of his, when he told his hearers, *pag.* 38. *So ſhall it go with your Souls, ſo will God deal with every one of you, as you receive or reject thoſe Truths of his*: A thing he calls *a damning Error* in me, when I ſay ſo but of men's being penitent godly Believers.

SECT. II.

Larg. Catech. *Qu.* 47.

Dr. Owen, *on* Heb. iii. 2, 3. *pag.* 21.

II. THE *ſecond* Point to be marked is, That *Believers are as righteous as Chriſt in equality, as to Suretiſhip-righteouſneſs.* For that's the Point. He ſaith little here for it; and I have ſaid enough in this Book againſt it; therefore a few words will ſerve.

SECT. II. His Authors rhetorical Sayings are more reconcileable to Truth than his Poſition. Mr. *Bradſhaw* affirms, "That Pardon "without the rigid Imputation of the "*active obedience*, ſerves to all ſaving pur-"poſes." But I'll diſmiſs this with theſe Remarks.

1. HE builds his whole notion upon a *Suretiſhip-righteouſneſs*, and never proves Chriſt to be *any ſuch Surety* as will at all infer, that we are *as righteous as he* on that account. I have carefully weighed what he hath written; and find what he ſaith for it, *pag.* 10. is, *that he is called a Surety, Heb.* vii. 22. I grant it; and he'll find, I have proved, that Chriſt is there called only *a Surety of the Goſpel-Covenant*; and therefore can, as mentioned in that place, be engaged to no more thereby, than what that Covenant includeth. Though yet I grant, that other Scriptures prove, that Chriſt undertook to be *the end of the Law for righteouſneſs*, and died *in our place* or ſtead, *&c.* of which I have inſiſted at large. And if this will not ſerve, he adds his All: *He who is obliged to pay another's Debt, or any part of it, is properly, and in ſtrictneſs, his Surety.* To which I anſwer, But not always ſo as that the Principal can be ſaid to pay that debt as much as he, nor be as juſt as he, nor be ſaid to be immediately releaſed upon his payment, *&c.* For if a Friend goes to a Creditor, and promiſeth to

pay

pay part of a Prodigal's debt; agreeing together, that upon ſundry terms, and in a fit time, and by degrees, the Prodigal ſhall be acquitted and releaſed; yea, and that his debt ſhall be remitted to him in a way of forgiveneſs by the very Creditor, and he ſtill be bound to certain Services thereby; I hope, all the former daring aſſumptions are prevented, and yet the Surety engaged to pay part of the Prodigal's debt. Should not Mr. *Mather*, pag. 10. forbear ſaying, that holy Mr. *Baxter* "wrangles againſt "and rejects this counſel of God againſt "himſelf," and only cite the place where Mr. *Baxter* argues this point, and offer no better proof? But that's their way; he ſhall reaſon, and they'll do their work by mere reproaches, and curſed cenſures. SECT. II.

2. He ſaith, *pag.* 75. "That Chriſt's "Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, and Inter-"ceſſion, are not imputed to Believers:" Yet all the proof he brings for an eternal *legal Union* between the Elect and Chriſt, and their being *one Perſon in Law*, is, *pag.* 59. "That they are ſaid to be *in him*, in "his reviving, riſing from the dead, and "ſitting in heavenly places." So that what in one place is the inſtance and ground of *legal Surety-Imputation*, in the other is excluded from being *imputed*. I hope, thoſe phraſes will, by his followers, not again be pleaded for *Suretiſhip-Imputation*.

SECT. II.

3. How dogmatically ſpoken is it, *pag.* 76. "That if it be *the ſame Righteouſneſs* "in which Chriſt and we ſtand, he and "we are, ſo far as that righteouſneſs makes "righteous, *equally righteous?*" But, Sir, he and we come not alike by it; and we depend on it, as in him, for all: He ſtands not in it ſo as to need forgiveneſs, which we do; yea, that forgiveneſs is oft repeated to us after we are made righteous: He is by it entitled to much more than we are, *&c.* of which elſewhere. And ſince he infers an *equality* from a *ſameneſs*, let me aſk, Are we *as ſpiritual* as Chriſt? And yet it is *the ſame Spirit* that is in Chriſt and in us. Are we *as much beloved* by God, as Chriſt our Mediator is? And yet Chriſt ſays, *Thou haſt loved them as thou haſt loved me*; —*that the Love wherewith thou haſt loved me may be in them:* Here's *As*, and *the ſame Love*, yet it were Impudence to pretend to be *loved equally*. Yea, our Lord ſays, *The Glory which thou gaveſt me, I have given them*: Here's *the ſame Glory*, but muſt we be *as glorious* as Chriſt *in equality?* Alas! Do not we ſee, that the *ſame Guilt* of a Fact may lie upon many, and yet all not be guilty in the ſame degree? Judge then, what an air of Aſſurance doth this ſhort-ſighted man breathe forth in the next words, "I can hardly think "any man is ſo forſaken of common un-"derſtanding, as to deny it:" Becauſe he

Joh. xvii. 23, 26.

Ver. 22.

cannot

cannot give convincing light, he will threat- SECT.
en us into it by calling us *mad*; and had II.
he thought this would have ſent more
open mouths after us, he would have given
us this term inſtead of *Semiſocinians*, men
that hold damning blaſphemous Errors, and
what not. But any man, that intimately
knew Mr. *Baxter* (whom he loads with
theſe Titles as well as others,) and Mr.
Mather, would not be long concluding,
which had more underſtanding, truth,
love to God and man, publick-ſpiritedneſs,
godlineſs, integrity, and whatever makes
a Goſpel-ſpirit and the Image of Chriſt
upon a man; to ſay nothing of humility,
good nature, freedom from envy and ma-
lice, *&c.* Yea, God bleſſed him more to the
real Converſion of Souls, than a hundred
Mr. *Mather's*; notwithſtanding his charg-
ing him, with *rejecting the counſel of God
againſt himſelf*; pag. 10. and holding *per-
nicious Soul-deſtroying Errors*; pag. 46. for
it is him, whoſe words he puts there in a
broken light.

4. HE very oddly evades the Charge of
the *Aſſembly*, who declare, "This *Com-*
"*munion* which the Saints have *with Chriſt*, Confeſſ.
"doth not make them in any wiſe par- *chap.* 26.
"takers of the ſubſtance of his God-head, *a.* 3.
"or to be equal with Chriſt in any reſpect;
"either of which to affirm, is impious
"and blaſphemous:" This Place I cited,
but would not repeat the words at *Pin-*

ner's

SECT. II.

ner's-Hall. To this he tells us, *pag.* 76, "This must be understood in a limited "Sense, *&c.* for taken absolutely, it will "not hold: Believers are *men* equally "with Christ, *&c.*" I answer, True; for he hath almost told us, we are *hail Fellows* with Christ: He was *not humbled* in being a man, nor is he *dishonoured* in our being *as righteous* as he; yea, we are told, *pag.* 7, "Christ's *Incarnation* may as justly "be said to be a part of his *Exaltation*, as "of his Humiliation." But though the *Assembly* intend not *the being of a man* in what they so severely brand, yet they mean nothing if they exclude what is so great a Perfection of Christ as *his Righteousness* is, when they fix *Blasphemy* on saying *we are equal with Christ in any respect*: They must think *his Righteousness* such a Prerogative, that they who will equal Christ in this, may next ask of him *his Kingdom* also; and Mr. *Mather* hath given us a handle for that, upon our very being *as righteous* as Christ. For, *pag.* 25. he at large shews, that Christ hath *two Titles to Glory*, a natural one, and an accumulated one, *viz. an acquired Title as our Surety*: And if you ask, what Glory that is, you'll find, *pag.* 56. "It is that special Revenue of Glory "and Praise, which the Father, who be-"gat his Son from eternity, and loving "him with an infinite Love, designed "him." Now then, if Christ's Title to all

all his acquired Glory be his *Suretiſhip-righteouſneſs*, and as to that we are *as righteous as he in equality*, what can hinder us, not only to have that very *ſame Title* to Heaven and Glory, as Chriſt hath as he is our Sponſor? but, I ſay, what can hinder Believers Claim and Title to the very ſame *high Throne* in Heaven, and to the very ſame degree of Glory, which Chriſt, as their Surety, hath a Title to? ſince Chriſt hath it for that very Righteouſneſs, which *they have as much of* as he himſelf; and that God gives, or rather pays them all *of remunerative Juſtice*; and that they are *one myſtical Perſon with Chriſt*: All which this modeſt Author affirms, *pag.* 15, 55. Reader judge, is this no other equality than in being *men* as well as Chriſt? SECT. II.

5. THOUGH he talks ſo much of *Suretiſhip-righteouſneſs*, he gives an uncertain ſound of *that Bond* wherein Chriſt and believers come into that *legal oneneſs*. For,

(1.) ONE while "he was *conſtituted a* "*Surety* in that Covenant between God "and him;" *pag.* 10. and thereby "there "was *a legal Union*, and this Union was "*from everlaſting*, and it was *of ſupercre-* "*ation Grace*, and *perfected* in the tranſ-"action between God and Chriſt." *Pag.* 59, 60. Reader know, that I grant, there was *a Covenant of Redemption* before time, and that therein Chriſt undertook to redeem and ſave elect Sinners, *&c.* But yet I deny,

SECT. II. ny, that by that Covenant Christ and the Elect were *eternally one legal Person*, or that he is *their Surety* in such a sense, as will render them legally esteemed to do and suffer all that Christ did pursuant to that Covenant; or that thereby they are *as righteous as he.* Thou wilt find my arguments in this Book; at present it is enough to say, We were never *Principals* in that Covenant, and therefore Christ could not be *such a Surety.* The thing insisted on in that Covenant was Redemption-work, and the Salvation of Sinners, as fallen; but the redeeming and saving of Sinners, or ourselves as Sinners, was never proposed to us as our Duty; it was inconsistent and impossible to our State as fallen. And with his leave, as it looks strange, the Elect should have two legal heads at once, *viz. Christ* and *Adam*; so if Christ and men were *eternally one legal Person*, I doubt, it may as well be proved, that Christ legally broke the Law in the Elect's breaking it, as that the Elect kept the Law in Christ's keeping it. Well, thus far here's a Surety without a Principal, and a work or debt which none was ever bound to, but him that is called *a Surety* in such a sense that many must be said to do and pay as much as he.

(2.) ANOTHER while "Christ's name "was put into *the original Bond*, in which "we by the Law and Covenant of our

"Cre-

"Creation were bound," *Pag.* 10. He told us before, he was *conſtituted a Surety* in another Bond, *viz.* the eternal Compact: And if ſo, then his name is put into this Bond, in performance of his antecedent Suretiſhip, and he is not *made a Surety* by putting his name in this Bond: Whence it follows, that what he doth pay of this Bond, can be ſaid to be paid by us no otherwiſe, than according to the nature of his Suretiſhip in the former Bond, wherein we have ſeen he was principal and ſole undertaker. I am glad by this that I need not argue with him, that if Chriſt was a proper *pecuniary Surety* with us in the Covenant of works, then it was either abſolutely or disjunctively: If *abſolutely*, that *he* would keep it, then we were not Parties at all engaged: If *disjunctively*, that either *we or he* would keep it, then it was never broken; for he hath kept it, and his obedience, without any ſuffering, ſufficed to fulfil it, *&c.* But Mr. *Mather* granting, (and that truly,) that Chriſt was *conſtituted Surety* in the Covenant of Redemption, prevents my inſiſting on ſuch things. Only ſtill note, as I have elſewhere proved, that Chriſt's being *made under the Law* (which he means by putting his name in the Bond,) was the *effect* of Chriſt's Suretiſhip. SECT. II.

(3.) YET inconſiſtently enough he ſays, *pag.* 14. "Chriſt was made our Surety, "*his Name was put* not only into the Co-

"venant

SECT. II. "venant of works, but into it as a *broken* "Covenant." Here all is ruffled again, and how ſhall we unriddle it? He was but now conſtituted a Surety in the eternal Bond, but here he is made a Surety in the broken Bond: He that diſtinguiſhed between aſſuming our nature and being conceived, no doubt, will find ſome Difference between *conſtituted* a Surety, and *made* a Surety; for that he muſt do, or he contradicts himſelf. Well, I grant that Chriſt came in our nature to obey the Law we had broken, and bear the puniſhment we had deſerved, and to anſwer the end of the Law which we had fruſtrated. But that will not make him *ſuch a Surety* in this *broken Bond*, as ſhall make us legally accounted to do all, and ſuffer and anſwer all, and be *as righteous* as he that did it; though it be in his very Righteouſneſs that we are ſaved, notwithſtanding we have failed in all this. For I aſk, when he *put his name* in this *broken Bond?* Sure, not before it was broken, for then he was Surety before. Again, when he did put his name, did he do it to the very *ſame purpoſe* as we were originally bound, *viz.* that we might live by our innocency and obedience as our righteouſneſs? No, it was to redeem us from the effects of our own diſobedience. Did he engage, that we ſhould do and ſuffer what would be a Price of our redemption and ſalvation? No, he was to do it himſelf

himſelf in his own legal Perſon: I ſay *legal*, SECT. because the divine dignity of his Perſon II. gave the *legal*, yea, *ſupralegal* Value in God's account to what he did and ſuffered; for one mere Man's doing and ſuffering what the mere Law enjoined, would not have ſatisfied for millions; and the broken Bond itſelf did not require a *divine Perſon's obeying* any more than the whole Bond did, though the Attainment of its ends did ſo. Again, if Chriſt's Suretiſhip was ſo limited within this *broken Bond*, then as he was bound to do and ſuffer no more than it required, ſo neither he nor we are entitled by that Obedience to any more than this broken Bond at firſt covenanted to give.

YEA further, Mr. *Mather* ſaith, *pag.* 57. "The Elect were conſtituted *(at firſt)* "under *another Head*, and under *another* "*Covenant*, which had nothing in it of "Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs, either to "be brought in for them, or to be ap-"plied to them."

Repl. BUT if Chriſt's righteouſneſs be no higher than that Covenant did require before it was broken, the righteouſneſs of perfect *Adam* had been as great as Chriſt's; And if the unbroken Covenant was the ſame as the broken Bond, How ſhould the unbroken Covenant neither have nor require any righteouſneſs of Chriſt's, and yet the broken Bond meaſure and limit Chriſt's

right-

SECT. II.

righteouſneſs, and ſentence us legally righteous for it? But if, as Mr. *Mather* ſaith, the Covenant with *Adam* and the Elect was *another Covenant* from the broken Bond; then we are not under the Covenant requiring what at firſt it enjoined; and being federating Parties only in the firſt, and ſubjected to penalty by it only as it is broken, here's no obedience-work for a Surety, nor place for a proper Surety in bearing the penalties. But I have elſewhere enlarged, and therefore conclude, That ſuch confuſion about the Suretiſhip ſhould abate men's regard to his cenſures againſt ſuch, as will not own he himſelf knows not what, and proveth none ſees how.

6. I FIND after all, that this equality of Righteouſneſs between Chriſt and us, is not ſo much from legal union, or judicial imputation, but from a *coaleſcence* of believers into *one myſtical Perſon* with Chriſt by a *Vital Union*. Thus we are told, *pag.* 55. "Between our believing and our being "juſtified, there comes in our coaleſcing "into *one myſtical Perſon* with Chriſt by "this *Vital Union*, and our having his "righteouſneſs upon us unto the Juſtifica-"tion of life; and ſo our being juſtified "is not the next or immediate effect of "our believing, *&c.*" Here indeed, if I underſtand what *one perſon* is, he may well argue we are *as righteous* as Chriſt; for we are *chriſtified* with Chriſt, not in name,

name, or on account of his undertaking, or of his being the Head of the Church as his myſtical body; but as being *one myſtical Perſon*, oppoſed to a legal Perſon: So that by pointing at any Believer, you may avoid the danger of that Saying, *If you believe not that I am he, you ſhall die in your ſins.* Joh. viii. 24. Mr. *Mather* may riſe higher, than that we are *as righteous* as Chriſt, and ſay, we are *as holy* as Chriſt, *as honorable* as Chriſt, *as wiſe* as Chriſt; and ſo interpret his proof from 1 *Cor.* i. 30. Nay, are we not aſſumed into a perſonal union with the Eternal Word, as the human nature of Chriſt is? which I think is unavoidable, unleſs Chriſt hath more Perſons than one; beſides, his being a *legal Perſon*, which he oppoſeth this *myſtical Perſon* to. And that he means ſomething like this, hear what he ſays, *pag.* 60. "It is called *a Vital Union*, "becauſe in effecting it there is *a vital* "*touch*, as I may ſay, between Chriſt and "us, and a claſping each on other." Compare this with what he afterwards declares, *pag.* 63. "The human nature of Chriſt "leans on the Godhead in the Son, and "hath the eternal power of the Deity "claſping about it, and holding it in that "Union: After ſomewhat of a ſimilitudi-"nary way, though with great diſſimili-"tude and diſparity, do we by Faith lean "and live upon Chriſt; the eternal pow-"er of the Godhead in Chriſt, (and not

SECT. II.

SECT. II. " ſo much the ſtrength of any created " principle of Grace in us,) holding our " hearts unto him, and cauſing them for " ever to live upon him." Can you find much difference, though he pretend a diſproportion? The awfulneſs of the Subject reſtrains me from expoſing this affected Cant, which is the only Goſpel with theſe men, becauſe it is *Myſtery*, that is, unintelligible Nonſenſe fitted to a *Roſecrucian*, or a *Behemiſt*. It is not enough, that Chriſt is the Author of all in us, and the Securer of all promiſed good to us; and that he condeſcended to confirm this, and to comfort our ſouls, by ſuch gracious Inſtances of a *myſtical union*, as that between the Vine and Branches, the Head and Members, the Husband and Wife; yea, that *the ſame Spirit* dwells in Chriſt and us; each of which inform, and aſſure to us, the Bleſſing deſigned to be ſignified thereby, but not whatever our profane Fancies may wreſt a metaphor, or force an expreſſion to. Muſt men ſtrain it to *one Perſon*, whereby Chriſt's Prerogatives and our vile Defects are in common to Chriſt and us? Is this to let *Chriſt in all things have the Preheminence*? Col. i. 18. The Scriptures needed not ſo many *metaphors*, to repreſent to us the ſeveral Benefits we have by Union with Chriſt: This one would have ſerved for all, yea, far exceeded all: Only that *one Perſon* would conſiſt but with few of them, nay with none;

none; Head and Members do not make *one Perſon*, but one Body; yea, one Spirit in Chriſt and us, doth not make *one Perſon*; unleſs you'll make the Holy Ghoſt to be an animating Soul to the Body, and ſo to be the chief conſtituent part of the whole Perſon. What will a deluded vain Fancy expoſe men to at laſt? SECT. II.

SECT. III.

THIRDLY, *I ſhall add ſome Exceptions againſt ſome other paſſages in Mr.* Mather's *Book.*

I HAVE been already engaged to hint at ſome; yet among many obnoxious enough, let us conſider ſome more of his *Stamina.*

I. HE declares, *pag.* 56. "God hath "ordained Chriſt to do all with God for "the Elect, and that he ſhall be all from "God to them: —All, I ſay, that in this "ruined condition they need to bring them "to that height of Happineſs, *&c.*" *Pag.* 58.

Repl. IF he had meant only, that Chriſt was to do all with God in a way of ſatisfaction, impetration, merit, or interceſſion, it were true; but as he words it, it may be very erroneous; and it is to ſcrue in an Error, he doth thus expreſs it. Hence, becauſe

SECT. III. becauſe he finds Repentance and Faith are ſo neceſſary to our ſalvation, he hath in his Pulpit endeavoured to inform men, how Chriſt *repented*, and that he *repented for us*; and though he doth not publiſh it in this Sermon, as he did elſewhere, *that Chriſt believed for us*; yet you'll ſee preſently, how much he endeavours to convince us that he did ſo; for if he believed whilſt humbled, it was for us, and it is imputed to us, as he oft in this Book affirms. Had I Mr. *Mather*'s liberty, what would I call this Error? for though it is in Chriſt's Strength and Grace that we repent, believe, turn to God, and do good works; yet if we do not theſe as our perſonal acts, Miſery will be our portion. *If you* (not I) *believe not, you ſhall die in your Sins:* And, *Except you* (not I) *repent, you ſhall all periſh*; ſaith Chriſt: And, *I ſay unto you, Except your righteouſneſs* (not mine) *exceed the righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees, you ſhall in no caſe enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* Had Mr. *Mather* been an Auditor, ſurely he had not ſaid, "Lord, "thou underſtandeſt not the Goſpel; it's "*thou* art to do theſe things; this is *the* "*deep Counſel of God*, however legally thou "ſpeakeſt:" He might as well ſay, It's thou Chriſt ſhalt *periſh*, as, thou Chriſt art to *repent*.

Joh. viii. 24.

Luk. xiii. 3.

Mat. v. 20.

II. HE tells us, *pag.* 62. "*Faith* is a "prime

" prime and principal part of our being SECT.
" conformed to the Image of Chriſt:" III.
And, *pag.* 63. " He is the firſt Pattern and
" original Copy of believing."

Repl. Is Chriſt's Faith the pattern of *Faith in Chriſt?* I remember ſomewhere Dr. *Goodwin* ſpeaks of *God's truſting Chriſt* till he was Incarnate; and of *Chriſt's truſting the Father* ſince the time of his Sufferings: Yea, we may eaſily grant, that Chriſt believed God's promiſe; and, as a man, depended and relied on God's power and truth. But this is no other Faith than *Adam* in Innocency acted, or than the Law of works directed to, By this account we may think better of the State of *Pagans*, than moſt do; for *without Goſpel-revelation* they may believe in God, truſt him, and depend on him. But what is this to the account the Scripture gives of *Faith in Chriſt?* Did Chriſt *come* to himſelf as a Saviour? Did he *receive* himſelf as a crucified Redeemer? Did he *eat* his own fleſh, and *drink* his own blood, for eternal Life? Did he *plead* his own Merits, and *rely* on his own Righteouſneſs, for Pardon and reſtored Peace? Did he *conſent* to be married to himſelf? Did he *look* to himſelf for healing? Or, to uſe Mr. *Mather's* account of Faith in this very page, *Did he go out of himſelf unto himſelf for all?* Yea, take part of his deſcription of *Faith in Chriſt*, pag. 39. " The *Subject*

SECT. III.

" *of Faith* is the heart of a convinced bro-
" ken-hearted Sinner: The very *nature of*
" *Faith*, and the acting of the Soul in it,
" is ſuch as doth imply and include a ſight
" and ſenſe of Sin and Miſery, and a live-
" ly heart-influencing Conviction of utter
" helpleſneſs in a man's ſelf, and unwor-
" thineſs to be helped by God, *&c.*" Reader, Doth *Chriſt's Faith* in the *nature* of it, imply a ſenſe of utter *helpleſneſs* and *unworthineſs* in himſelf, or of his *Sin and Miſery?* The reaſon he gives, for juſtling out ſuch as *Abraham*, and ſetting up Chriſt for the original Copy of believing in himſelf, is this: " The human nature of Chriſt
" lives and ſubſiſts in the Second Perſon,
" leaning on the eternal Deity of the Son
" of God; it hath its ſubſiſtence in the
" boſom of the Godhead, *&c.* and hath
" the eternal power of the Deity claſping
" about it." *Pag.* 63. The Apoſtle did not know this Faith, when he ſaid that *Charity* was *greater than Faith.* Well, as ſublime as this reaſon ſeems to be, I will venture to ſay, This is not that *Faith in Chriſt* which the Goſpel requires of Sinners. And to this purpoſe,

(1.) I WILL give you a reaſon of Mr. *Mather's*, which be ſure is none of the beſt; *pag.* 7. " Chriſt's *dwelling in our*
" *nature* is no part of the puniſhment of
" Sin; for then the *Divine nature only* is
" puniſhed, and not the *Human* at all,
" nor

" nor the Perſon." It's a bad one for what he brings it, ſince that *aſſuming the nature* and *dwelling in it* differ; and I have anſwered it before, and it needs a great allowance to keep it from *&c.* But if the ſufferings or acts of only one nature be not the ſufferings or the acts of the Perſon of Chriſt; then the acting of Faith of the one nature on the other nature, is not acting of Faith upon the Perſon of Chriſt; and conſequently not *Goſpel-Faith*, which is to be acted on the Perſon of Chriſt: Here the human nature believes, but that is not with him, *Chriſt* that *believes*; it believes on the Divine nature, and that with him is not *Chriſt* who is *believed on*. What now is become of *Chriſt's believing*, even by his own reaſoning?

SECT. III.

(2.) THE object of *Faith in Chriſt*, is God-Man Mediator, a crucified Chriſt, *&c.* but the Deity of the Son of God abſtractedly conſidered, is not God-Man Mediator, *&c.* Truly if our *Goſpel-Faith* is ſpecified by this, I ſee not the need of Chriſt's Incarnation or Death, nor of regard thereto.

(3.) THIS *leaning*, and eſpecially to the purpoſes aſſigned to this act of Chriſt's human nature, is not all that which is eſſential to the *Faith in Chriſt* which the Goſpel requires. But why ſhould I ſcribble the little Paper left? It's like the reaſons he gave for Chriſt's repenting, *viz. The reproaches*

SECT. III. *proaches of them that reproached thee, are fallen upon me*; and he *was a man of ſorrows, and acquainted with grief.*

III. HE plainly diſcovers his Mind to be, that *Faith* is an act of the Soul whilſt ſpiritually dead and unregenerate. *Pag.* 61. he joins with ſuch as ſay, "*Faith* is "the means and way of our being made "ſpiritually alive, rather than our acting "Life, as being already brought into a "ſtate of Life; as the Body's claſping hold "on the Soul by the animal Spirits, which "are *corporeal things*, is rather the means "of Life, than an act of Life, *&c.*" And, *pag.* 62. "Suppoſe that the principle of "Grace, begotten and created in us in "Regeneration, do contain in it the ha-"bit of Faith, which I will not now call "in queſtion; yet, *&c.*" Again, *pag.* 32. "All our new Obedience, and all the "Graces of the Spirit comprized under "that one word *Love*, are the effects and "fruits of our being juſtified." And, *pag.* 60. "In Union *(by Faith*, which is the "*cauſe* of this Union,) we are brought "immediately into a ſtate of Spiritual "Life, firſt relative, then qualitative, *&c.*"

Repl. HERE, with the *Arminians*, he denieth the *habit of Faith* to be neceſſary to the actings of Faith. He is contrary to the *Aſſembly* of Divines, who tell us, that "God in *effectual Vocation*, takes away the "heart

Confeſſ. *chap.* x. *ſect.* 1.

" heart of ſtone, and gives a heart of Fleſh, SECT.
" *renewing their Wills*, and by his power III.
" determining them to that which is good,
" and effectually drawing them to Jeſus
" Chriſt:" To which they add, that Ibid. *a.* 2.
" Man is altogether paſſive therein, until
" *being quickned* by the holy Spirit, he is
" *thereby* enabled to anſwer this Call, and
" to embrace the Grace offered, and con-
" veyed in it." And in their *Catechiſm* Larg. Cat.
we are told, " Faith juſtifies a ſinner *Anſ.* 73.
" in the ſight of God, not becauſe of thoſe
" other Graces which *do always* accompany
" it, or of good Works that are the *fruits*
" of it, *&c.*" Here we ſee, that there is a *quickning regenerating work and change on the Heart and Will*, in order to the act of Faith; that there is no Faith *unaccompanied* at any time by other Graces; and that by *good works* they intend not ſuch Graces, *&c.*

DID not Mr. *Mather* tell us, *pag.* 60. that *in effecting our Vital Union, there is a vital touch, as I may ſay, between Chriſt and us, and a claſping each other.* Is there *a vital touch* before Life, or *a claſping* while we are dead? Doth the Mind ſee Chriſt, whilſt it's *blind*; or the Will embrace him, whilſt it's morally *dead*, impotent, unperſuaded, and averſe? Do we conſent to Chriſt, and covenant with him, whilſt Satan, Sin and Enmity reign in our faculties; or open the door to Chriſt, whilſt theſe keep the keys? God ſaith, *The natural man* 1 Cor. ii. *receiveth* 14.

SECT. III.

receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, becauſe they are ſpiritually diſcerned: But Mr. *Mather* ſaith, Yea, it's while they are *natural*, that they ſee Chriſt and cloſe with him. Here's a knowledge of an ignorant mind; here's a coming and receiving without Life: Here's a Faith the Goſpel-covenant never promiſeth; for it's not included in God's *wriing his Laws in the heart.* The whole ſtreſs of Salvation is laid by him on an Act of a dead unregenerate ſinner; and men are juſtified, while the Soul is not *turned from darkneſs to light, nor from the power of Satan unto God.* It were worth aſking him, whoſe Act this act of Faith is? It's not a human act, unleſs you can ſuppoſe the Mind and Will can act without any vital principle, yea, againſt it's own prevailing principle: Here then muſt be a force, and unactiveneſs too, in our very acting; and it's a ſtrange *claſping* of what we hate and abhor. I doubt, here may come in again *Chriſt's believing for us.* However,

Act. xxvi. 18.

(1.) HE muſt think, that our Faith *after we are alive*, is either a Faith *ſpecifically diſtinct* from that which juſtified us; or it's ſtill an Act not effected by a regenerate principle, but is ſomewhat either *below* life, or *above* man, even when he is ſpiritualized. He ſeems to bid at both: His *Simile* is for the firſt; *the Spirits*, which he

he ſaith *are corporeal*, claſp about the Soul for Life; ſo it ſeems our Faith is a dead thing always, never made Life or living, any more than thoſe Spirits are made *Soul*; otherwiſe it loſeth its *claſping* meetneſs, as they would do in ceaſing to be *corporeal*. Yet other times he makes it look like *a Divinity claſp* about us. SECT. III.

(2.) I DO now ſee a little, why the man is ſo againſt God's giving us any ſaving benefit in any *way of Reward*, though not of debt: It's becauſe Faith is the only thing *ordained*, (not required,) as a phyſical means on our part; and this is ſo *low* a thing, that a dead ſinner may act; or ſo *ſublime*, as not to be a human act.

(3.) AGAIN, I ſee why he doth ſtill confine our Juſtification to the end, to the *firſt act* of Faith; yea, and deny the immediate influence of Faith on our Juſtification: For if you ſhould bring it among Duties, or to be under the notion of *a Duty*, all is ſpoiled: No, it muſt be a mere phyſical Band of union, not enjoined by God as our Ruler, but appointed as the *corporeal Spirits* for Ligaments. I dare not touch the Philoſophy part of that, leſt if I name *Embrio*, he ſhould curſe me anew.

(4.) I KNOW now at laſt, why he thought me a *Pelagian*, (the ſelfiſh reaſon why he wrote it to *London*, I knew long ſince;) becauſe I in a printed Sermon put the Act of Faith *after ſpiritual Life*. It ſeems,

SECT. III. ſeems, I ſhould have ſaid with him, *pag.* 60. "That in Union with Chriſt as one myſtical Perſon, (which is by the efficient "*cauſality* of Faith,) we are brought immediately into a ſtate of Spiritual Life, "firſt relative in our Juſtification and "Adoption, and then and thereupon qualitative, *&c.*" His proofs for *Faith before Life*, becauſe Chriſt promiſeth Life upon believing, are contemptible; as if further ſpiritual Life, and Pardon, and eternal Glory, be not *Life*, as well as Hell is *Death*, and ſome ſinners *twice dead*.

IV. THE *Faith* he ſo much inſiſts on, hath not all the *eſſentials* of a ſaving Faith. I know many worthy men diſtinguiſh between Faith *quæ juſtificat*, and *qua juſtificat*; and no doubt, the Soul hath an eſpecial reſpect to Chriſt as Prieſt, and to his Righteouſneſs in order to Juſtification. But our diſcourſe is of the Faith *quæ juſtificat*. What that Faith is, he tells us, *pag.* 62. "*Faith* is a going out of ourſelves "unto Chriſt for all." And *pag.* 40. "The heart's acting towards this object in "its believing, is moſt properly in a way "of truſt, and dependance, and affiance."

Repl. [1.] WE have juſt ſeen, it wants a vital principle, as it is the Act of an unregenerate dead Soul. Now this brings it, in the Judgment of moſt Divines, to be no *ſaving act* at all, no *ſaving Faith*, becauſe

cauſe the act of a natural and dead Sinner. SECT. [2.] I need not mention, that it is no *obedientiall* act. And note, That when our Divines deny, that Faith is not imputed as an act of believing, or as an evangelical act of obedience; they ſay, it's not *as ſuch* imputed as our juſtifying righteouſneſs, which I grant. But they poſitively affirm, that *the Faith* by which Chriſt's righteouſneſs becomes imputed, is *an act of evangelical obedience*. Again, [3.] I will not inſiſt how far the aſſent of this Faith is limited, as to its object, as well as its nature. [4.] I grant, that by Goſpel-faith we truſt in, and depend on Chriſt as our only Saviour; and that by it we *go out of ourſelves to Chriſt* for all atonement, merit, cauſality of acceptance of all we do, and Strength and Grace to enable us to all. Yet, [5.] See how much more the *Aſſembly* includes in *ſaving Faith*: "By this Faith, a Chriſtian believeth to be true *whatever* is revealed in the Word, for the Authority of God himſelf ſpeaking therein; and acteth differently upon that which each particular paſſage thereof containeth, *yielding obedience* to the Commands, *trembling* at the Threatnings, and *embracing* the Promiſes of God for this Life, and that which is to come: But the principal Acts of ſaving Faith are *accepting*, *receiving*, and *reſting upon Chriſt alone* for Juſtification, Sanctification,

III.

Confeſſ. *chap.* xi. *a.* 1.

Ibid. *ch.* xiv. *a.* 2.

" tion,

SECT. III.

" tion, and eternal Life." [6.] His Faith wants the *receiving* of Chriſt, if not wholly, yet *as a Prophet and Lord:* Whereas Col. ii. 6. true Faith *receives Chriſt Jeſus the Lord.* [7.] Here's no *yielding up* ourſelves to our Redeemer's conduct, no *dedication* of ourſelves to him as our owner, guide and ruler, nor *conſent or engagement*, or purpoſe of heart, *to do ſo:* Whereas Goſpel-Faith is ſuch a *truſt* of and on Chriſt, as includes a *yielding up ourſelves* to him, to be ſaved by him in his own way; as he ſets down the terms, *viz.* to deny ourſelves, to take up our Croſs, and be his Followers and Diſciples. *Iſa.* xliv. 5. *Rom.* vi. 13, 16. *Luke* xiv. 26, 27, 33. *Jer.* xxx. 21. [8.] Here's no purpoſe of heart to renounce the World, Fleſh, and Devil, who are Chriſt's rivals and competitors; to whom we before, did yield up ourſelves. 1 *Pet.* iii. 21. *Joh.* v. 44. That muſt be ſurely a ſtrange *conjugal conſent*, wherein the Wife promiſeth no duty or loyalty; only expects all to be done for her. But yet,

Obj. *If we truſt and lean on Chriſt, we ſhall do theſe.*

Anſ. (1.) IT is as true, if we do theſe, we ſhall and do *lean on Chriſt*; and by that rule we may as well call theſe *Faith*, and leave out that. (2.) It is not a *ſaving Truſt* in Chriſt, that doth exclude theſe, or is without them. This is plain; becauſe the act of Goſpel-Faith is oft expreſſed by theſe,

theſe, as well as by Truſt; and a Sentence of condemnation lies ſtill upon a Soul that wants theſe, and is under the power of their contraries. *We will not have this man to reign over us*, was the language of unbelief; *and for this they were ſubject to death.* (3.) The Scriptures tell us of inſtances of a *Truſt* and *leaning*, that proved deſtructive for want of theſe other things, and certainly will prove ſo to all others. Thus it is ſaid, *The Prieſts teach for hire, and the Prophets divine for money; yet they will lean upon the Lord, and ſay, Is not the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us.* Nor is it to be doubted but the *fooliſh Virgins* had a degree of Truſt in Chriſt; yet were they loſt for want of Oil, though they looked for ſo much from him. Yea, (4.) As he wordeth it, and joineth it in other places, it looks to be a mere *contemplative act*, which as a man that's unregenerate doth with him perform, ſo a carnal man may do it for indulging his Sloth and Careleſsneſs; as if he were to ſay, "I will now and "then apply to this meditation, *Chriſt ſhall "do all for me*; I truſt him to do ſo, and "therefore I am ſafe, tho' I do no more; "yea, I ſhall be damned if I ſtrive to do "any thing elſe as a means of obtaining "ſaving benefits, though it be in Chriſt's "righteouſneſs that I expect all." And yet we are expreſsly warned, *Not every one that crieth, Lord, Lord, ſhall enter into the kingdom*

SECT. III.

Luke xix. 14, 27.

Mic. iii. 11.

Mat. vii. 21.

SECT. III. *kingdom of heaven, but he that doth the Will of my Father*; and this was to inforce that charge, *Enter ye in at the ſtrait gate.*

V. HE aſcribes too much to *Faith*, as imperfect, dead, and unholy a thing as he makes it; even more than I dare for a world aſcribe to that which is the true Goſpel-condition. For he expreſsly tells us, *pag.* 51. "There is between our be-"lieving and this righteouſneſs being upon "us, *a reference of Cauſality.*"

Repl. WE muſt be *Soul-deſtroyers*, and be deſtroyed, for ſaying, God *requires Faith*, ſuſpending Pardon till we believe, and by his Promiſe ſecuring it to us when we believe; though we expreſsly deny *all cauſal Influence*, and confine the *condition* to the mere frame of the object; and do leave Juſtification in all its cauſes entire, as the Benefit to be given in Chriſt's right to him that is a believer. Yet our Accuſer, Witneſs, and Judge, can innocently cry up a *Cauſality*, a real and proper Cauſality; a *mediate* Cauſality of Juſtification, an *immediate* Cauſality of Union with Chriſt, which is the greater benefit: *Pag.* 52. *My ſhort Legs can follow theſe ſmall ſtrides.* It's a cauſe of *Juſtification*; but how? By more than that rule, *Cauſa cauſæ eſt cauſa cauſati.* Faith is a cauſe of *Union*, that Union is a cauſe of Chriſt's righteouſneſs being upon us, and that righteouſneſs being upon

upon us is the cauſe of Juſtification; and ſo Faith is an influential cauſe of Juſtification. If you go *forward* with what Juſtification is the cauſe of, and what that is alſo a cauſe of, *Faith* is a cauſe of even as much, and in the ſame ſort as it is of Juſtification; and if you go *backward* to the next cauſe of Faith, and to the cauſe of that, even *all that* is the cauſe of Juſtification, as much, and in the ſame ſort as Faith is. And what *kind of cauſe* is Faith in all? It's always with him a Phyſical cauſe, a natural *touch* and *claſping*. Yet *pag.* 52. he ſaith, *It's by God's conſtitution or ordination*: Hopeful words! but he ſoon throws it out of a *moral Cauſality* again, and brings it to *the corporeal Spirits claſping* about the Soul. Here's a *Covenant-conſent*, without an act conſidered as any way *moral*; a ſtrange thing to any man of ſenſe, who muſt know, that Acts are conſidered only as *moral acts* in every *Covenant*. SECT. III.

VI. HE accounts all performance of any Duty with an expectation of any ſaving benefits as morally connected therewith, to be *in a legal manner and Spirit, from legal or old Covenant principles, and unto old Covenant ends*, &c. *pag.* 28. Compare *pag.* 71.

Repl. I HAVE fully proved, that though nothing done by us is *the righteouſneſs* wherein we ſtand before a juſt God, nor is the merit of any Good, or any atonement

SECT. III. for Sin, or instead of a legal righteousness: Yet there is in the Gospel a display of Authority, though in a way of Grace, and a *rectoral way* fixed for giving out the effects of Christ's obedience in his righteousness, as benefits encouraging to duty: And in that way we must expect them to the glory of God's Truth and Promises, and we wickedly presume in expecting them otherwise; and hereby Obedience to Christ and the Righteousness of Christ are not opposed, nor old Covenant-ends pursued. Mr. *Mather* saith, *pag.* 49. "Faith hath *no In-*"*fluence*, no not so much as in a way of "*Instrumentality*, to confer upon us a right "and title to Christ's righteousness; all the "Influence that Faith hath, is only to our "actual possession of it." I grant, [1.] That Faith is not our justifying righteousness. [2.] That Christ hath merited, the Elect shall have it. [3.] That it is the Gospel-promise is our title and charter. Yea, [4.] I deny *all causal Influence* to our possession. But as to him, who ascribes to Faith *a Causality*, I would ask, (1.) Doth not the Gospel adjust by its Promise, that it is the Believer it will invest in this possession of righteousness? (2.) Doth not this Promise entitle a Believer to this possession, and bar the Unbeliever. (3.) Doth *Faith* then no way affect our right or title to the possession thereof? Doth it not render us *the persons* whom it so entitleth thereto? And is this nothing,

nothing, though it be not the righteouſneſs for which we are juſtified, as legal obedience was to be? SECT. III.

VII. HE ventures too far, in making the Crown of Glory and Juſtification to be effects of ſtrict *remunerative Juſtice* as to us; which is untrue, notwithſtanding Chriſt's righteouſneſs is imputed to us. *Pag.* 12, 13, 15. Among many other expreſſions of this kind, he ſaith, "It is the conſtitution "of God, that all the ſaving Good and "Bleſſing which ſhall be given *us*, ſhall "be *given*, not only from Free-Grace, "but by the hand of *Juſtice*."

Repl. IF he mean only, that the Conſideration upon which all ſaving Good was granted, is a Righteouſneſs that anſwered ſtrict Juſtice; I grant it. But to ſay, (which he ſeems fully to intend,) that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is ſo imputed to us, as that Benefits are actually conferred on us in a way of *remunerative Juſtice* as to us, I deny it, and ſay, It is a thouſandfold worſe, than they whom he condemns durſt ever have a thought of. I own alſo, it's a reward of Juſtice *to Chriſt*, that Believers ſhould be juſtified and glorified: But Juſtification and Glory are given of mere Grace to thoſe Believers, though in a Goſpel-way of Government. They cannot plead, "Now, Lord, I have Chriſt's "righteouſneſs on me, I have a Claim to "theſe,

SECT. III.

" theſe, as a debt or reward *due to me* from " remunerative Juſtice:" For tho' Chriſt give the Crown in his own right, and by his right we have that Crown ſecured; yet he reſerves the Claim of *Juſtice* to his own Perſon, and we muſt accept of all, even at God's hand, *of Gift*. Sinners ſhall not have the Saviour's Plea in themſelves, tho' he will plead it for their Good. There is more ſpiritual Pride in this kind of Talk, than many imagine: *The Gift of God is eternal Life*, even when he gives it; and it is not only as to antecedent cauſes, we *look for the mercy of Chriſt unto eternal Life*: And it's ſtill for Chriſt's ſake we muſt intreat and expect, and not for our own, nor for any thing as it's ours, whatever be the effect of the Imputation of Chriſt's righteouſneſs on us.

Rom. vi. 23.

Jud. *ver.* 21.

VIII. THAT which he calls *telling a Story* to us *of the deep Counſels of the Wiſdom and Grace of God*, how this righteouſneſs is upon us, *from its firſt and higheſt Original*, (pag. 56.) is in ſeveral things an unſafe account, and greatly to the diſhonour of Father, Son, and Spirit. Some parts of it I have already conſidered; I now ſhall briefly obſerve theſe things, [1.] He ſtrikes at the eſſential Glory of the Son of God. [2.] He deſcribes the Fall of man in a way very diſhonourable to God. [3.] He much miſtakes what is moſt properly the

the Glory of God. And, [4.] He leaves out man's acknowledgment of the Holy Spirit in the work of Salvation. SECT. III.

[1.] Mr. *Mather* ſtrikes at the eſſential Glory of the Son of God. Before I prove this, I would premiſe, (1.) The Son of God as Second Perſon in the Trinity, is equal to the Father in Eſſence and Glory, though he be *of the Father*, as to the mode and manner of Subſiſtence. Hence he hath the ſame Divine perfections and glory. (2.) Whatever is aſcribed to Chriſt, before he aſſumed the human nature, muſt be ſuch as is conſiſtent with his divine nature as the Son of God, and proper thereto. (3.) Nothing is added to the divine nature as in Chriſt, by its union to the human nature, beſides relation to that human nature. (4.) The Perſon of the Son of God was compleat, before he aſſumed the human nature; and therefore the human nature is no conſtitutive part of the Second Perſon; but, as Dr. *Ames* well ſaith, is only as an adjunct. If Mr. *Mather* mean more, it's horridly dangerous, when he ſaith, *pag.* 8. "The human nature belongs "to the *conſtitution of Chriſt's Perſon* as he "now is:" And it looks the worſe for his words, *pag.* 7. "Chriſt's dwelling in our "nature is no part of the Puniſhment of "Sin, for then the divine nature only is "puniſhed, and not the human at all, "nor the Perſon:" As if what terminated

SECT. III.

on one nature only, did not terminate on Chriſt's Perſon; and by the ſame rule, the acts confined to one nature, as their Principle, are not the acts of his Perſon, unleſs they be the acts of both natures. (5.) Since the Incarnation, we frequently meet with a perſonal *communication of properties*; and what is proper to either of the two natures, is aſcribed to Chriſt as God-Man; as *Chriſt died*, &c.- (6.) Yet there is neither a transfuſion or communication of the properties of one nature to the other; nor muſt we aſcribe to his Perſon any thing in any manner that would tend to the confuſion of the two natures. (7.) All the Glory or Humiliation that can be juſtly aſcribed to the Son of God as ſuch, cannot infer any change in or addition to him, and muſt be confined to what is *manifeſtative and relative*: His Glory may appear more, but cannot be added to; it may be obſcured, but it cannot be really diminiſhed. (8.) Hence whatever addition of real Glory or afflictive Suffering belongs to Chriſt, it is with reſpect to his human nature: This only was capable of rewards, of being exalted, of being deſerted, of God's hiding his face, and of dying. I ſhall now evidence, that Mr. *Mather* ſtrikes at the eſſential Glory of Chriſt, as the eternal Son of God.

1. HE makes Chriſt, as the eternal Son of God, capable of an *addition* to his real Glory

Glory as God. *Pag.* 56. "God the Father "*from eternity begat* his Son, the *Second* "*Person* in the Trinity, and *loving him* "*with an infinite Love*, designed *a special* "*Revenue of Glory*, and Honour, and "Praise *unto him*, as from all his Crea- "tures in their kind and way, so more "eminently from and in a certain num- "ber of mankind:" To which he adds, "The end and *upshot*, and last Issue, that "all his counsels about them come to, "is this, that they may be brought to the "*acknowledgment of the Son of God*, &c." And, *pag.* 61. "You see how the *grand* "*original Design* of God, to bring in *a* "*Revenue of singular Honour*, and Praise, "and Glory, to his *Son* Christ, is in this "way brought about, *&c.*" I shall pre- sently repeat more: Let us consider, SECT. III.

(1.) IT is plain, he intends the Son of God as such: It is he, as *begotten from Eternity*; he, as the *Second Person* in the Trinity; it's he, as *loved with an infinite Love*; yea, from his being so infinitely be- loved as God's eternal Son, the Contrivance had *its Rise*. The *Design* in the *upshot* is, that he might be *acknowledged* to be *that Son* of God. It cannot be meant, that this additional Glory might be designed for him, as foreseen Mediator, or as in Flesh: For this Design is *the first step*, and this Glory of the Son is *the Original* of all the contrivance: He was, pursuant to this

SECT. III. purpoſe, *made* a Mediator and legal Head; and he tells us, to confirm this, *pag.* 56. "That for this end of bringing a Revenue "of Glory to his Son, in the Salvation of "the Elect, *God ordained, that he ſhall "do all with God for them, and that he "ſhall be all from God unto them*;" which is his *ſecond ſtep*: And therefore what is ſubſequent to the other in Intention, cannot be before it; his Office and Incarnation are but *means* to this end. So that no doubt can remain, that Chriſt is in this Deſign conſidered as the eternal Son of God.

(2.) LET us weigh how he deſcribes the Glory intended. It is *a ſpecial Revenue of Glory and Honour*: It is a Revenue of *ſingular Honour and Glory*; ſomewhat that made him more glorious than he was, as the Son of God: Nay, it was his being *acknowledged to be the Son of God*, which is the *upſhot* of the Deſign about him; as if though he were Son before, yet he would not have been *acknowledged* to be the Son of God, without this added Revenue of Glory. But again,

2. HE makes the eternal Son of God conſidered as to his Divine Nature, to be for a while *under the frowns and diſpleaſure of God*. Pag. 25. And,

3. HE makes the eternal Son of God *as God*, to be capable of an *acquired right*, (ſuperadded to his *natural right*,) even *to his eſſential Glory* as God; and alſo of an acquired

quired right *to that Love*, which he en- SECT.
joyed as the Son of God in the Divine Na- III.
ture before he was the Son of Man. Take
his words, *pag.* 25. " It is true, Chriſt
" hath another title and right, both to the
" Love of God, and unto Heavenly Glo-
" ry, *viz.* by the prerogative of his Birth,
" I mean his Eternal Generation, as he is
" the only begotten Son of God: But
" *though he was rich*, yet ſuch is his
" Grace, that *for our ſakes he became poor*;
" he conſented (not to *forego his title*, but)
" for a time to *forego the actual enjoyment*
" of the full fruit and benefit *of it*. He
" was contented to *lay aſide his Glory* for a
" time, and to dwell here below on earth
" *under the frowns and diſpleaſure of God*
" *his Father*, until he ſhould fully, to
" the utmoſt farthing, have paid our
" debt: But then he was to be *reſtored and*
" *raiſed up to the enjoyment* of his Father's
" Love, and Heavenly Glory, in the vir-
" tue of that forementioned *double right or*
" *title*, viz. both as the Son of God by
" Nature, and alſo as having diſcharged
" all the debt of the Elect as their Surety;
" this latter being *accumulated* and *ſuper-*
" *induced* upon the former, and therefore
" being *not a natural*, but an *acquired*
" *title*." Where,

(1.) You ſee, that it is the eternal Son of God, conſidered as to his Divine Nature, which was *under God's frowns and diſ-*

SECT. III.

diſpleaſure: For it was only as to that nature his Perſon was the ſubject of God's Love *before* his Incarnation, and it was *that Love* alone that he could be *reſtored* and raiſed to, which he had *before* his Incarnation; and there could not be a reſtoring and raiſing to the enjoyment of this Love as to this nature, unleſs that he was *under the frowns and diſpleaſure of his Father* as to his Divine Nature. For in whatever nature he *enjoyed* the Love of God, before he did *forego the enjoyment of it*, and to the enjoyment of which he was *raiſed and reſtored*, that muſt be the nature in which he endured thoſe frowns and diſpleaſure, which are oppoſed to the actual enjoyment of that former Love. He tells us, that he did *forego the actual enjoyment* of *this* Love, and ſo *dwelt under his Father's frowns* here below on Earth; therefore it muſt be as to his *Divine Nature* he did forego the enjoyment of that Love and Glory: And conſequently, as to *that nature* he endured the oppoſite frowns; ſince that he had not enjoyed that Love in his *human nature*, before he dwelt on Earth. And,

(2.) IT is as plain, that he makes the eternal Son of God, as to his Divine Nature, to have a *ſuperadded right* to that *eſſential Glory* from God which he had a former *natural right* to: For the Glory he enjoyed *before* his Incarnation, was his *eſſential Glory* as the Son of God; and it was his

his essential Glory he had a *natural right* to. Again, he had no Glory in his *human nature* before he was man, to be restored to; therefore the Glory he had an *acquired right* to, being a Glory to which he was *restored and raised*, must be his *essential Glory* enjoyed only by the Divine Nature: He could be *restored to the actual enjoyment* of no Glory, but what he actually had *before* he assumed our Flesh, and could not be restored to any Glory which he had not till he assumed our Flesh. The matter is the same, as to *the Love* that *his Father* bare to him as his eternal Son: For it is *the Love* he was *restored to the enjoyment* of, which Christ is said by Mr. *Mather* to have an *acquired superadded Right* to; which must be no other than he was the Object of *before* his Incarnation: Yea, he declares, it is that very *love* and *glory* which was due to him *by the prerogative of his Birth*, that he had this *superadded title to*; yea, even that which he *did not forego his title to*, though he *did forego the actual enjoyment* of it for a while; and to this he was restored *in the virtue* of this *double right*. So he tells us, Christ *was rich*, yet he *became poor*: How poor? By *foregoing the actual enjoyment* of the full fruit and benefit of it, which he enjoyed before. The *meaning* of the place he refers to is, that though the Son of God was maker and heir of all things, yet, as to his human

SECT. III.

2 Cor. viii. 9.

SECT. III. human nature, he was in a neceſſitous ſuffering caſe. But hence Mr. *Mather* infers, that Chriſt, as the Son of God, did *forego the actual enjoyment* of the full fruit of his Inheritance, which he fully poſſeſſed before; and in that reſpect was *poor*: This is plainly his Senſe, for he ſpeaks of *his being rich*, as he was *antecedently* to his Incarnation, as to enjoyment as well as title; as to which *Riches* he did *not forego his title*, as he was the Son of God; and yet, *the full benefit* of thoſe very *Riches*, he was ſo entitled to as Son of God, he *did forego the actual enjoyment of*: Whereas he might as well ſay, he did forego the enjoyment of *all* the benefits as of *any*, and as well of his title as of the enjoyment; all being alike poſſible to the Son of God, who ſtill enjoyed that whole Inheritance to the full as Son of God, as he enjoyed it by his title before he was the Son of Man. To forego the *manifeſtation*, and the *actual enjoyment*, differ as to *his Glory*: And as to *Riches*, it is one thing for the human nature to want; and for the divine nature to abate any enjoyment of what it was entitled to, is quite another thing. A *poor* God is a wild Phraſe. But ſhould it be ſaid,

Obj. *Had Chriſt, as our Redeemer, a right to no Glory as a Reward?* I anſwer, (1.) Yes, to a Glory and Riches as to his human nature. But, (2.) That was not a *reſtoration*

ration of what the Son, as God, enjoyed *before* his Incarnation; but a *Glory* and *Riches* granted as to his human nature, which *fully commenced* upon his Exaltation, though eternally decreed: And to both indeed there was a *title*, from the Union of the human nature to the Divine Perſon; and alſo *as a Reward* of what was ſuffered and done in the human nature. Yea, (3.) The utmoſt *Glory* belonging to or received by Chriſt as *acquired*, was of *another kind* than what belonged to him as God, and which he enjoyed before his Incarnation. The one is *dependent*, the other *independent*; the one is *Creature-Glory*, though above Angels, the other is *increated*, eſſential, and divine, even the ſame with the Father's. Again, if it be ſaid, SECT. III.

Obj. *Did not Chriſt lay by his Divine Glory?* I anſwer, (1.) He could no more part with it, no, nor with the enjoyment of it, than he could part with his Divine Eſſence. Yet, (2.) He voluntarily agreed to have it *veiled* as to *manifeſtation* for a time; but did not in the leaſt quit the enjoyment of it as the Son of God. And hereupon, (3.) The ſenſible communications of it, and of the Divine Favour, were a while *much ſuſpended* from the human nature: But conſidered as the Son of God, he always alike poſſeſſed and perceived the Divine Glory and Favour. The Father could as well be *diſpleaſed* with himſelf,

as

SECT. III. as with his Son, as he was God. And hence, (4.) Though what Chriſt did and ſuffered, did entitle him to the *reſtoring* of the ſenſible enjoyments of the Divine Favour to the human nature, yet there was no place or room for *acquiring a right* to any ſenſible communications of Love, Riches, or Glory to him, as Son of God: For they were never ſuſpended, they were eſſential to him; and to ſuppoſe an *acquired right*, were to make that Love and Glory *dependent*, and to bring them within a Creature's ſtate; whereas you may ſee Chriſt in his humbled State, when he ſpeaks as the Son of God, ſtill aſſerting *his title* and *poſſeſſion* in Equality with the Father, yea, and declaring them to be the ſame. *Joh.* xvi. 15. *Joh.* v. 18, 19, 26. *Joh.* i. 18.

READER, judge how he honoureth Chriſt. I could tell him, what names the antient Church gave to ſuch a Hereſy; but I better like, that he gives to my opinion *cauſleſly* the name of *Bleſphemy*, than that I ſhould give ſo *juſt* a cauſe, though I met with a man ſo mild, as ſhould hope it was only *ignorant*. The Son of God, *as God*, to be capable of an *addition* of real Glory; to be the Object of God's frowns and diſpleaſure, and capable of parting with the enjoyment of God's Favour, and the Glory and Riches he had before he was Incarnate; and to have an *acquired right* to that

that eſſential Glory, and Love, and Riches, *ſuperadded* to his *natural right* thereto; are ſuch Poſitions, as ſhould make a man to tremble how he ventures afterwards to meddle beyond his depth. My concern for theſe things prevents my uſing the advantage Mr. *Mather* gives me. SECT. III.

[2.] HE deſcribeth the *Fall of man* in a manner very diſhonourable to God: For he makes it a *deſigned* neceſſary *means* reſolved on, to bring to the Son of God that Revenue of honour and praiſe which the Father had before deſigned for him. This is fully expreſſed by him in his Model of the eternal Decrees. The *firſt* Step is, the *deſign* of that Revenue of glory to the Son. The *ſecond* is, Chriſt's being to *do all for the Elect* with God for them, *&c.* The *third* is, making man innocent. The *fourth* is, the Fall of man. The *fifth* is, the *double Union* iſſuing in legal and myſtical Perſons. The *ſixth* is, that *Faith* is the *means* of myſtical Union. And the *ſeventh* is, that this *Faith* in its nature is *to reſt on Chriſt for all.* Pag. 56,—60. The thing I infer is, that *the Fall* being the *fourth* Step, muſt needs be a thing reſolved on, in the Father's *deſign* of a Revenue of glory to Chriſt by ſome men's acknowledging him to be the Son; for that's *firſt* in order reſolved, and then *the Fall* appointed (not over-ruled) as a neceſſary *means* thereto; as that by which he was to

obtain

SECT. III. obtain this Glory, and without which he muſt have gone without it, and been limited to the *privilege of his Birth.* Therefore he tells us, *pag.* 58. "This *Fall of* "*the Elect* into a ſtate of Sin, and Death, "and Wrath, may ſeem ſomewhat remote "from the point in hand: But it is not; "for hereby *a Door is opened* to the Son "of God to ſtep in, and do all with God "for them, that in this ruined condition "they need, *&c.* So that as Chriſt ſpeaks "of the blindneſs of him who was blind "from the womb, *Joh.* ix. 3. that it was "*that the works of God might be made ma-*"*nifeſt in him*; we may ſay this of the "*Fall of the Elect*, it was *in the Counſel* "*of God deſigned to this end*, that the depths "of the riches of the knowledge and wiſ-"dom, and grace, and power of God, "might be made manifeſt in them: And "as Chriſt ſpeaks of *Lazarus* his ſickneſs "and dying, *Joh.* xi. 4. that *it was not* "*unto death, &c.* So muſt we ſay of this "falling of the Elect into a ſtate of ſpiri-"tual death in ſin and treſpaſſes; *it is* "*not unto death* for ever, *but for the Glory* "*of God, that the Son of God might be glo-*"*rified* in recovering them."

Repl. (1.) I AM ſure, the Son of God did not need any ſuch Glory; he had been as happy and perfectly glorious as now he is, though Man had ſtood. (2.) It ſeems very unagreeable to the purity and goodneſs

neſs of God, to *deſign* the breaking of his own Laws, the deſtroying of the greateſt part of mankind, the defacing of his own Image, the gratifying of the Devil in the ſin and miſery of men, ſuch diſhonour to his own name, *&c.* and this as a *neceſſary means to glorify his Son:* To decree the *permiſſion* of the Fall, and ſo to over-rule it to good ends, is another thing. (3.) By this Model it was as impoſſible for man to have ſtood, or for the moſt of mankind to have avoided Sin and eternal Ruin, as it was for man to have hindred God to give to his Son that *ſpecial Revenue* of glory that he deſigned for him; which I think would be a greater eaſe to the damned, than their conſciences will feel, or the pleadings of God with men will import. (4.) It greatly abates that admiring and thankful regard to God and our Saviour, which the Scriptures always direct us to: For if Mr. *Mather*'s Model be right, it was *Love to the Son of God* that brought men to *need a Saviour*, and not *Love to Sinners* that inclined God to *give his Son*, and the Son to give himſelf, *to be a Saviour*; as *Joh.* iii. 16. The utmoſt which this Model can riſe to is, that ſince God reſolved for the Glory of his Son, that *all ſhould fall* into a ſtate of ſin, and death, and wrath, that thereby *ſome of them* might be to his Glory, *they* were ordained to be *ſome* of thoſe; which indeed is a mercy,

SECT. III.

SECT. III.

but not ſo greatly diſplaying of Divine pity, love, and grace, as the Word repreſents it. And therefore, (5.) To ſuppoſe Man foreſeen as fallen and ſelf-ruined, and thereupon a Saviour ordained, to recover and actually ſave a certain number of theſe; and for this to be in his ſuffering nature rewarded, and eternally exalted, receiving the praiſes of his ſaved ones; fully anſwers the account the Scripture gives of the oeconomy of Redemption. *Rev.* i. 5, 6.

MAN is ſuppoſed thus fallen, in all the texts which Mr. *Mather* cites for God's deſign of a Revenue of glory to his Son from the Elect. *Eph.* i. 3, 4, 5, 6. We are *choſen in Chriſt*; in what State? You'll ſee that, by the nature of the Bleſſings we are to obtain by him; to *be holy*, who were by the Fall unholy; to be *without blame before him in love*, who were ſo reproveable and hateful; to *the adoption of Children*, who had by Sin loſt our natural birthright, and become aliens; to be *accepted in the beloved to the praiſe of the glory of his Grace*, who had made ourſelves unacceptable and condemnable in the Eye of Juſtice; and to have *Redemption in him, and forgiveneſs of Sins, according to the riches of his Grace*, who had enſlaved ourſelves, committed Sin, and were incapable to redeem ourſelves, to make atonement, or merit our recovery: And then it follows, *ver.* 8. that in all this *he abounded towards*

us

us in all wiſdom and prudence. Amazing wiſdom! To find a way, to ſanctify the depraved, juſtify the blameable, love the hateful, adopt the alien, accept the vile and unworthy whom Juſtice condemned, redeem the captive, and forgive the guilty Sinner! Here's work for *all wiſdom and prudence* to *abound*, much more than it was, to reſolve firſt to glorify the Son of God; and then to find out a way for it by *deſigning* to make men *fall* into miſery and death, that he might come to this Glory by it. Look into *ver.* 9. and you'll ſee, that according to what I have ſhewn to be the Apoſtle's Model, he concludes, this is *the counſel of God's Will, and his Purpoſe in himſelf*, even to recover by Chriſt Sinners, thus in his eye fallen and miſerable. The ſame ſenſe is plain, in *Rev.* v. 11, 12. 2 *Theſſ.* i. 10. and *Eph.* iv. 13. SECT. III.

I CONFESS, when I conſider ſome men's temper, I am at a loſs, whether they are led, by what themſelves are, to think of God as ſo cruel and far from goodneſs; or whether the ſtrange repreſentations of God, which they believe, do form them to what they think is his Reſemblance. Would any Divine elſe dare to preach, "that God "took the Sin of *Adam*, and ſqueezed out "the Quinteſſence of it into the human "nature, to propagate to the world? And "that God *took delight* to ſee the Wicked "ſin: As one that ſets Rats-bane to kill

SECT. III.

" Rats, looks through the key-hole with " delight to ſee the Rats eating the Rats-" bane, knowing it would kill them; ſo " God looked at the Wicked through his " fingers with Pleaſure, to ſee them ſin-" ning, knowing it would deſtroy them. " And that the Spirit of God ſtriving with " Sinners, did enlighten them, reform " them, *&c.* But why did he thus ſtrive " with many, whom he did reſolve he " would never ſave? It was, that they " might be brought to thoſe higher de-" grees of Torments in Hell, which he " had fore-ordained them to; as *Judas* " went *to his own place*, that is, to the " higher Torments in Hell, which God " had decreed him to: He could not come " to this, but by falling from his Apoſtle-" ſhip; he could not fall from his Apoſtle-" ſhip, if he had not been an Apoſtle; and " he could not have been an Apoſtle, if the " Spirit of God had not ſtriven with him." Mr. *Mather*, I ſuppoſe, hath not forgotten theſe unſavoury Paſſages, which I do not think I have varied a word of; at leaſt I am ſure this is the Subſtance, and not aggravated at all, as I have abundant Witneſſes to prove.

[3.] HE miſtakes what is *the Glory of God*, as to its principal ſenſe: This conſiſts in his eſſential Perfections, as in himſelf; yea, the *manifeſtative Glory* of God, Father and Son, is not ſo much in the Crea-

Creatures acknowledgments, as in the diſ- SECT.
play of his own Perfections, in a way com- III.
manding their admiration and love: Men's
Hoſanna's are a poor thing comparatively
even therewith. He *made all things for his Glory*; that is, to expreſs thereby his wiſdom, goodneſs, power, juſtice, *&c.* His Glory ſhines forth more in the Impreſſes of his Excellencies on any Being, than in their thankful returns of Gratitude to him, or in the oral mention of his Praiſes: Men by theſe do their Duty, and contribute to their own Good, but add not to his Glory; yea, his *manifeſtative Glory* is not hereby ſo promoted by thoſe men, as by his Image on them, and his Authority acknowledged by obedience and *good works.* God is *glori-* Mat. v. 16.
fied by Chriſt, as Redeemer in our nature, as by this means his Government was honoured, his Juſtice ſatisfied, his Hatred to Sin expreſſed, his Image reſtored, his Authority among men acknowledged, his bleſſed Nature exemplified in the humane nature and behaviour of Chriſt, his Love and Mercy to Sinners made manifeſt by his death: By theſe, I ſay, God is *more glorified*, than by the honour Chriſt acquires from his Creatures, or by ſome few being brought to acknowledge him to be the Son of God. Yea, our Redeemer, even as in our nature, is *more glorified*, by his honouring God, vindicating his Government from contempt, opening a way for Mercy

SECT. III. to exert itſelf without injury to God's Holineſs or Juſtice, accompliſhing God's Purpoſes and Promiſes, having all fulneſs of Grace in him, all Authority and Judgment committed to him; by his defeating Satan's projects, and breaking his ſtrength and power even by the human nature; by his giving his Spirit, and reſtoring the Image of God to a degenerate world; by his rendering men ſubject to the divine Laws, Imitators of his Example, and ſubject to his Authority; by his raiſing the dead, and judging the world; by his wiſe, equal, and effectual managing his Kingdom, *&c.* By theſe, I ſay, he is honoured far more, than by a few perſons *acknowledging his Sonſhip*: And being that *his Sonſhip* became *obſcured* by his dwelling in Fleſh, I admire that Mr. *Mather* would place the *upſhot* of Chriſt's acquired Glory in the Elects *acknowledgment of his Sonſhip*; as if he took a Veil to do and ſuffer ſo much, chiefly, if not only, to buy off its being a Veil.

[4.] HE leaves out *the Holy Spirit*, as to the mention of any Glory deſigned to him in the oeconomy of the Salvation of Sinners. Yet ſure, the eternal Spirit hath a Glory ſuperior to Chriſt's human nature, and a Right thereto ſuperior to Chriſt's acquired Right. Yea, we are *baptiſed*, as redeemed ones, *into*, or *in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt*. But with theſe men, *his Honour* is little regarded; he ſhall not have a

Mat. xxviii. 19.

hand,

hand, ſo much as to render ſome Sinners to be the perſons, that ſhall rather than others be inveſted in Chriſt's right to any ſaving Benefits according to a Goſpel-rule: Though God hath ſo wiſely contrived the acknowledgment of Father, Son and Spirit, in the ſaving of Sinners; the Father *gives* and ſends his Son to redeem, the Son *pays* the price of redemption, and the holy Spirit *applies* it, by rendering Sinners the objects of the reſpective effects thereof, as the Goſpel determines the diſtribution of them. SECT. III.

His notion of *legal Union*, between Chriſt and the Elect from eternity, as being *one legal Perſon*, is an unſcriptural notion which I have confuted; though I acknowledge, that Chriſt from eternity undertook to redeem and ſave the Elect; but that is far from *one legal Perſon*, being that we are not reputed to redeem or ſave our ſelves. And alike ungrounded, is his notion of *one myſtical Perſon*. But it is time to put an end to my Remarks on *his Story* made up of *Steps*; which I wonder *he* hath acquired no better ſkill in relating, than to repreſent *the counſels of God*, in a manner ſo inconſiſtent with, nay, reproachful to, the Glory of the bleſſed God.

IX. I shall not take notice of ſuch things as theſe: "That all your *obedience* "to the Law avails no more to juſtify you, "than your *worſt Sins*;" *pag.* 71. "That

SECT. III. " the *not failing of Faith* is not a means of " our continuing juſtified;" *pag.* 64. And " that *Repentance* is the effect of Pardon, " and *not neceſſary* thereto;" *pag.* 32. Theſe, and the like, being already inſiſted on in this Book, and elſewhere. Neither ſhall I demonſtrate, as I might; that it muſt be his Judgment, that *all our Sins are pardoned at once*, even paſt, preſent, and to come; and that *God cannot be diſpleaſed with, or afflict Believers for their Sins*, &c.

X. HE vainly ſuppoſeth many things poſſible to be in *unbelievers*, which are certain evidences of true Faith, and are effects of Faith; yea, they are the execution of the conſenting act of Faith, and *without them* (if a man have time,) all his Faith is but *a dead Faith*, that will never ſave. I will admit, that *no act* of Grace or Godlineſs can ſave us *without Faith*: But I as poſitively affirm, That there is *no one act* of real Grace or Godlineſs *without true Faith*; nor yet any true Faith without acts of other Graces. Why then ſhould he put the Graces of the Spirit into a war, and tell us of *mending our ways, and reforming our lives and our hearts too, ſo as never more to ſin, and living as a Saint dropt down from heaven*, &c. *yet they are not Faith, neither would the righteouſneſs of Chriſt be upon thee thro' all theſe things?* Pag. 67, 68. Can men's hearts be changed, and their lives thus reformed

formed in obedience to the call of Chriſt's Goſpel, and not accept of Chriſt, and truſt in him? No. And I aſk, If any man go out of himſelf to Chriſt for all, and yet never repent, nor have his heart and life changed, nor love God, would that man have the righteouſneſs of Chriſt upon him for Salvation? Yet this is as poſſible as the other, yea, and more eaſily miſtaken. You'll ſee, in 1 *Theſſ.* i. 5, *& ſeq.* that the Spirit of God makes the things concur, which Mr. *Mather* would ſet at ſo great an Oppoſition. SECT. III.

To me it's evident, that *Chriſt's righteouſneſs* extends itſelf through all the benefits and privileges of a Saint, as the ſole *meriting Cauſe*, whatever be the *Condition*: And all the after-gracious Acts and Godlineſs of a Believer are the operations of Faith; they are his firſt conjugal conſent executed, as well as the effects of his dependance on Chriſt for new ſupplies. And in this manner, (1.) Faith, as it acts *upward towards Chriſt*, ſtill craves, prays, hopes, truſts, expects, with affection adheres, and renews Self-dedication and Conſent. (2.) As it looks *into the Word*, it finds motives, excitements, directions, *&c.* to urge and apply to itſelf, from inviſible things realized. And, (3.) As it acts *under the power* of both the former, with reſpect to external and internal effects, it purifies, melts, loves, quickens, ſtrengthens to duty and againſt tempt-

SECT. III. temptations, comforts, reclaims, recovers, guards, watches, &c. So that our renewed Acts of Repentance, Love, and Fear, &c. our Godlineſs, Reformation, Zeal, and all ſincere Obedience, are the *operations of Faith*, and the *obedience of Faith*: Faith is in them, and they are in Faith, not *formally*, but in the way above expreſſed: Whence I conclude, it's *a falſe Faith* that omits obedience to Chriſt in *all* theſe, as it is *a falſe obedience* which excludes a dependance on Chriſt in or by *any* of theſe Acts.

XI. Mr. *Mather*'s Criminations of his Brethren are intolerable, becoming neither an honeſt Man, nor a true Believer, and much leſs a Goſpel-Miniſter. More wicked malice and falſehood hardly any man can be guilty of, than his accuſations and inſinuations are juſtly chargeable with; unleſs they proceed from real Ignorance, which Charity prompts me to hope. I have inſtanced already, how he hath perverted my words; but had he confined his Reproaches to me, I ſhould not think my Reſentments ſo fit to be expreſſed: But he ſpares not the Dead, he ſtrikes at the Body of our uſefuleſt Miniſters alive, and at their Miniſtry too. Who, or what, could excite any man to render the Labours of ſo many Miniſters uſeleſs, when ſo adapted to promote the Kingdom of Chriſt in the world? Who will dare to attend their Labours,

Labours, or avoid being filled with Jealouſies, Prejudices, and Abhorrence, who believe this fiery man, when he ſaith, That they hold *Soul-deſtroying Errors, if there be any ſuch in the world*; *pag.* 46. that *it is a diſlike and heart-hatred of ſtanding juſtified in the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed, and in it only, that lies at the bottom in theſe Oppoſitions* (to our being as righteous as Chriſt;) *pag.* 76. and that *the Devil* (by them) *laboureth to foreſtall and ſhut up men's hearts againſt* (what he calls) *the bleſſed Truths. Pag.* 26. Nay, his malignant Spirit riſeth ſo high, as to call them oft *Semi-ſocinians*; and he ſtudiouſly brands them with that name (as what he would have them called by,) in his *Preface*, as well as with that of *Socinians* in his Sermons; and adds, that *the Goſpel of our Salvation is craftily and inſolently aſſaulted by them in the very vitals and fundamentals of it.* This and much more, as an *Apoſtacy from the Truth*, he fixeth on old and young, even *many of the riſing Generation, not only among Conformiſts, but Diſſenters alſo.* Pref. *pag.* 1.

SECT. III.

Repl. THE Angel ſaid, *The Lord rebuke thee*; when he *durſt not bring railing Accuſation.* Sure he knoweth not what Spirit he is of, nor who doth inſtigate him to theſe things, any more than holy *Peter* did, whoſe deſign was better. After long working at this Trade under ground, he proclaims it when he comes into open air, and

SECT. III. hides not his Spirit or his Purpoſe. I hope others injured ſo deeply, will join with me in forgiving him, and praying for his Repentance, that *the blood* of prejudiced Souls *may not be required at his hands*, nor theſe injurious Reproaches be imputed to him. I ſhall make a few Remarks on the Names he gives us.

1. HE of all men ſeems leaſt allowed to give us any Name; for we are not the Children of his Church-members, and others he will not baptiſe. He pleads, that *the antient Church* called the Off-ſpring of *Pelagius* his Hereſy *Semi-Pelagians*: May therefore one, that utterly denies *a Catholick viſible Church*, pretend to it; yea, who thinks he ceaſeth to be a Miniſter, when his relation to his particular Flock is at an end? Nay, he is of ſo raſh a Spirit, of ſuch ſmall Skill in the reaſon of Names, and ſo laviſhly diſregardful of Truth in this matter, that a *Nick-name* muſt be the effect of his giving any to ſuch as are not of his own Faction.

2. HE quits all Truth and Modeſty, in giving us the Name of *Socinians*, or *Semi-ſocinians*. He ſaith, our opinions are *the off-ſpring* of *Sociinianiſm*: But what meaneth he by *off-ſpring*? Is it only, (1.) That *Socinianiſm* was the occaſion thereof: Or, (2.) That they are of the ſame genuine nature with *Socinianiſm*. The laſt is an abominable Slander, hatch'd by no good Spirit. It is enough to anſwer, (1.)

(1.) The former may be pretended, but then an *immediate deſcent* muſt be denied. *Socinianiſm* tempted weak men to the oppoſite Extream of profane *Antinomianiſm*: This Extream was perceived equally fatal to the Vitals of practical Chriſtianity, as *Socinianiſm*; and alſo to give advantage to the *Socinians* by its wild Poſitions, and weak Arguments conſonant thereto: Therefore our beſt learned Divines, at once to prevent the triumph of the *Socinians*, and the growth of *Antinomianiſm*, waved many of thoſe terms, which had obtained among the Orthodox in ſpeaking of Chriſt's Satisfaction without any due regard to either of theſe fatal Errors. Hence Dr. *Owen*, of the *Trinity* and *Satisfaction*, pag. 153. ſays, "It appears from what hath been ſpoken, "that in this matter of *Satisfaction*, God "is not conſidered as a *Creditor*, and Sin "as a *Debt*, and the Law as an obligation "to that Debt, and the Lord Chriſt as "paying it." He then ſhews the difference; and tells us, "God muſt be conſidered as a *Rector*, &c." *pag.* 113. And *pag.* 141. "There is an alluſion in them, "[*the* Socinian *argument*,] to a *Debt and* "*Payment*, which is the moſt *improper* "*expreſſion* uſed in this matter." The ſame you'll find in *Eſſenius*, *Triumphus Crucis*, pag. 391, 399. and in *Turretin*, *Inſtit. Theol.* par. ii. pag. 264, 462. In like manner, they place *Satisfaction* in an equi- SECT. III.

valent

SECT. III. valent in many things, and not the same for kind in all. See *Essenius*, pag. 340. and Dr. *Stillingfleet* of the *Sufferings of Christ*, pag. 244, 245. Many more instances might be given. But,

(2.) OUR Principles are far from being the *off-spring* of *Socinianism*, as being *of the same nature with it*, which he meaneth. They are nothing which is properly *Socinian*, or condemned as such either by *Synod* or by men of Learning: So far are we from being *half-Socinians*. The *Socinian* Principles are summarily reduced to that of the *Trinity*, and that of *Christ's Satisfaction*. They deny the *Deity* of Christ, as the Son of God by *eternal* generation; we affirm it: They deny the *Personality* of the *Holy Ghost*; we affirm it. The malice of our Author cannot pretend to touch us there. The *Socinians* deny, that Christ died a *proper Sacrifice* for Sin; we affirm it. They deny, that Christ's Sufferings were the *Punishment* of our Sins; we affirm it. They deny, that Christ *satisfied* Divine Justice, or died *in our place*: We affirm, he *satisfied* Justice, and that Christ died *in our place* and *in our stead*: He died, that we might not die, who were liable to die; he gave his Life for ours. They say, Christ died *for our Good*, not by way of *Merit* at all strictly: We affirm, that Christ *properly merited* all the saving Good we enjoy. The *Good* they say

ſay Chriſt died for is, the giving us an *Example* of patience, confirming his *Doctrine*, and at higheſt, the *ratifying* the Covenant wherein our own Faith and Obedience is by *Acceptilation* accepted inſtead of a perfect legal Righteouſneſs, and this excluſive of Chriſt's Satisfaction and Righteouſneſs; and that he attends to this is what they mean, when they ſay Chriſt in ſome ſort may be ſaid to give us Life. But we affirm, that the *Good* Chriſt merited is, *Reconciliation with God, Pardon of Sins, and eternal Glory*, &c. as well as that he gave us an Example of patience, *&c.* And we truly affirm, that we have *no Righteouſneſs* that anſwers the *Law* but Chriſt's; and that *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs* is *imputed* to us, as that wherein we ſtand before a juſt God, and is as available to us for Salvation, as if *we* had done and ſuffered what Chriſt did; and we renounce all our own Obedience and Works, *legal* and *evangelical*, as *any part* of that Righteouſneſs, in or for which we are pardoned, accepted, or glorified. Our very *Faith*, and much leſs our *Repentance* or other good Works, is not any merit or procuring cauſe of our Juſtification. The whole uſe and place we aſſign to *Faith* in our Juſtification, and to *Repentance* in the pardon of ſin, is, that they are the things which the Goſpel requireth in thoſe, to whom God will impute the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt for actual Pardon, and

SECT. III.

SECT. III. and a title to eternal Glory; as promiſing to impute Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to Believers, and actual Pardon to the believing Penitent; as alſo, the poſſeſſion of Glory to ſuch as perſevere in Faith and Holineſs; and all, in, by, and for the *only* Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, as the *ſole* meriting, inclining, and procuring Cauſe.

READER, judge between us, yea, let the *Searcher of hearts* judge, whether we are not wronged by this Brother. I have in this Book, as well as formerly, ſhewn, that by *Reward* is meant no more than an encouragement to a Duty eſtabliſhed by the Goſpel, as a Law; not a Law, whereby governing *Juſtice* enjoineth us to work out a Righteouſneſs as our title to eternal Life; but a Law, wherein *Grace* in a way of government appoints Conditions, that render us the *ſubjects* of ſaving Benefits, as the effects of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, and to be received and enjoyed in his Right. Again, whereas ſome call Faith our *ſubordinate Righteouſneſs*, I have evidenced, that they intend no more than a *performed Condition* of the Goſpel, and no way a Righteouſneſs of the ſame kind, or to the *ſame end* or purpoſe with Chriſt's Righteouſneſs. Alſo when any of us ſay, that we are juſtified by Faith *as an Act*, Juſtification is then taken in quite *another ſenſe* from Juſtification by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs; the laſt being *univerſal* as to our Perſons and State;

State; while the former only relates to a *particular* Point, *viz.* Are we Believers? and but consequently, Are we the Persons whom the Gospel promiseth to deal with as Believers? Also I have shewn, that Justification is entire in all its *Causes*; and that Faith doth no more than connote us the *Objects* or *Subjects*, on whom this Justification is conferred by God as a *Benefit*, or the *Objects* on whom the Justifying Act *terminates* by the Gospel. If these be *Semisocinian* Principles, I undertake to shew, that all or most of the noted Protestant *Confessions of Faith*, and the Body of our Protestant *Divines of name*, yea, especially such as have written against *Socinianism*, are *Semisocinian*. Sure then our Author either reads our Principles in a false glass, or he knows no more of *Socinianism*, than that it is a scandalous word, and so fit to brand those with, whose worth, acceptance, and usefulness, he beholds with an envious eye; wherein I except myself. SECT. III.

Mr. *Mather* hath done more to favour *Socinianism*, than all those whom he accuseth: In that,

(1.) He calls such *Semisocinian*, whose Doctrine and Principles will approve themselves to most men to be Orthodox. Many will thus abate their prejudice against the real *Socinian*, as not being so bad as the word imported.

(2.) He falls in wholly with the *Socini-*

SECT. III.

ans, in denying Chriſt's *Incarnation* to be *a part of his Humiliation*, and deprives us of the force of one of the greateſt Texts for the *Deity* of Chriſt, *Phil.* ii. 6, 7.

(3.) HE ſupports the *Socinian* cauſe, and one of their ſtrongeſt topicks againſt the *Satisfaction of Chriſt*; by ſpeaking ſtill of God as a *Creditor*, Sin as a *Debt*, the Law as a *Money-Bond*, and Chriſt as a *Money-Surety*: Whereas all our Divines find it impoſſible to defend that Doctrine, without denying this Metaphor; and therefore plead, that God is to be conſidered as a *Rector*, Sin as a *Crime*, Sinners as *Criminals*, and Chriſt as a *Sponſor*, in conſiſtency with his being Redeemer, Mediator, Saviour, Sacrifice, and Prieſt, *&c.* For if Sin were a *Money-Debt*, why could not God forgive it *without Satisfaction*, as well as other Creditors do? *&c.*

(4.) HE grants the abſurdity, in the ſenſe objected by the *Socinians*, and ſtill oppoſed by our Divines, *viz.* That we are *as righteous as Chriſt* in equality. *Turretin* proves, (*Inſtit. Theol.* pag. 714, 715.) that "*licet*, *&c.* though we are juſtified by "Chriſt's Righteouſneſs imputed, *non ſequitur nos non minus juſtos eſſe quam "Chriſtum*; it doth not follow *that we are "no leſs righteous than Chriſt.*" So doth Dr. *Owen* of *Juſtif.* pag. 509, 510. And all our celebrated oppoſers of *Socinianiſm* do the ſame. Mr. *Mather* may ſay as well

well of theſe, as he doth of us, for deny- SECT.
ing it as they do; *They have a heart-hatred* III.
of ſtanding in the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt.

(5.) THE *Socinians* have their whole cauſe favoured againſt the *Deity* of Chriſt, (or at leaſt the *Arians,*) by what he aſſerts concerning the Perſon of the Son of God. He makes him ſuch a God, as was capable of a *real glory* to be *added* to him: He tells us, that as God he might be under God's *frowns* and *diſpleaſure*; that he might *quit* and *forego* the actual enjoyment of *that love, glory, and Inheritance*, which as the Son of God he was entitled to, and poſſeſſed of, before his Incarnation, (and this, not in a way of *manifeſtation* only, nor as to his Human nature, but in *reality*, and as to his Divine nature, in which alone he acted before his Incarnation;) that he was capable as God, of an *acquired Right*, ſuperadded to his *natural Right*, to thoſe very riches, love, and glory, which he enjoyed before he was Son of man; and tells us alſo, *pag.* 8. that *the human nature belongs to the* Conſtitution *of the Perſon of the Son of God, as it is now*, &c. Are not theſe bold Strokes, which I have before fully proved to be his aſſertions? though Charity binds me to acknowledge, that I think, he deſigneth not to oppoſe the eternal Deity of the Son of God, by aſſertions ſo unſuitable to the Divine Eſſence; but that he miſtaketh *what* God is, rather than *who* he is.

SECT. III.

(6.) I MIGHT add, that he blaſts all the oppoſition made by our beſt Authors againſt *Socinianiſm*, by branding even them as *Semiſocinians*: To ſay nothing of his repreſenting the Doctrine of *imputed Righteouſneſs*, in a manner not defenſible, and tempting to moſt men's being *Socinians*, unleſs they have a better notion of it. Few will believe, that we did *legally do and ſuffer* what Chriſt did; that we are *as righteous* as Chriſt; and that the Goſpel enjoineth *no Duty as a Condition* on us, for obtaining the bleſſed effects of Chriſt's Merits; which be the only ground of his quarreling thus hotly with us. Men of his ſuſpicious temper will judge, he deſigneth to favour *Socinianiſm*, by calling us *Semiſocinians*.

XII. Mr. *Mather* attempts to inſtruct us *how to preach*, but with an evil inſinuation, and in ſome things very contrary to Apoſtolical preaching. *Pag.* 69. "Thus "your Teachers ſhould inſtruct and lead "you: This is the Apoſtle's direction to "*Titus*, that he ſhould *teach them that* "*have believed, to be careful to maintain*, "or to excell in *good works*; Tit. iii. 8. "not to teach and preſs Sinners in their "unbelief, to fall to *doing of good works* "*firſt*, and *overlook believing* wholly, or to "*poſtpone it* after them."

Repl. [1.] WHICH Teacher of his hearers

ers doth teach any to postpone Faith, or overlook it wholly, or delay it at all? if by *believing* he means a due accepting of a whole Christ. Yea, do not they direct them to expect all from God through Christ, and to look to Christ as him in whom all fulness is? But our Author is one of them who think, *Christ is never preached*, unless *his name* be mentioned, and that as *a Priest* too. To teach men his revealed *Truths*, and his enjoined *Laws*, &c. is not *preaching Christ*. But, SECT. III.

[2.] MAY one call Sinners to *no Duty*, till they are *Believers?* Must they not be press'd to examine themselves, to pray, to read the Word, to hear it preached, to fear God, to teach their Families, to love their Wives, to meditate, to consider, to strive with their Hearts, to resist Temptations, to believe the Scriptures, nor to relieve the Poor, till they be Believers? *Peter* was to learn of our Author to preach; for though he knew *Simon Magus* to be *in the gall of bitterness*, yet he bids him then *repent of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee*: Perhaps he'll say, *he believed*; true, in such a manner, as I fear some that pretend high to Faith exceed not. *Paul* also gives such an account of much of his Ministry at first to Jews and Gentiles; *that they should repent and turn unto God, and do works meet for Repentance.* The

Acts viii. 22.

Acts xxvi. 20.

SECT. III.

Baptiſt too was an ill Teacher; aud *Chriſt*'s Sermon on the mount, and *Paul*'s at *Lyſtra*, needed Mr. *Mather*'s direction. *Paul* ſaith to unbelievers, *We are men of like paſſions with you*, (thus far he'll agree,) *and preach unto you, that ye ſhould turn from theſe vanities unto the living God that made heaven and earth*, &c. Here a good Work is preſſed *before* they believed; and Mr. *Mather* would have told him, You *Paul* ſhould not teach thus. But what are his Reaſons?

Acts xiv. 15.

(1.) THEY that *believed in God* ſhould be *charged to excell in good works*; therefore they that *believe not in Chriſt*, ſhould not be preſſed to *endeavour* doing any good work: They muſt not ſo much as *frame* their doings, *to turn unto the Lord.* And,

Hoſ. v. 4.

(2.) A FEW words after this he ſays, "Through Faith *that Righteouſneſs will* "*be upon you*; and being upon you, *it* "*will produce good works.*" Here it ſeems, (as I have oft heard it urged,) Miniſters ſhould not urge you, nor ſhould you ſtrive and labour after good Works; *this Righteouſneſs will produce them.* But are all, that I hope have Faith, ſo abundant therein, as not to need Spurs? Do all that pretend to it, ſhew that they have it *by its fruits?* and how elſe can we know them? And is *this Righteouſneſs being upon us* the next principle of good works? for though it be the *meriting cauſe* of all as it is in Chriſt, yet

holy

holy habits are the *next principle* with the Spirit's influence. And above all, muſt we ceaſe to *declare the whole Will of God* to all that hear us, till we know is Chriſt's Righteouſneſs upon them? Yea, is it becauſe they are *dead in Sin* before Faith, that we muſt not preſs them to repent, to fear and love God, *&c.* The ſame reaſon will hold againſt preſſing them to ſaving Faith, which of themſelves they can as little perform. And if it be *by the Word* that God regenerates our hearers, why may not the Spirit infuſe Life, by calling men *to repent*, &c. as well as *to believe?* and a true principle of Life will act duly, though I think not in the ſame order of diſcernable actings, in every Convert. But however, it is certain, that if by preaching Repentance the Spirit quickens a Soul, that Soul is as ſure *to believe* when quickened, as it is *to repent* when it believes. And ſo our Author makes but *a ſpiteful Flouriſh*, when he would induce our Hearers to think we teach them amiſs, becauſe we learn not of him. SECT. III.

SINCE the printing of my Anſwer, to what Mr. *Mather* calls my Second *damning Error, viz.* That *I make the State of Believers to be* undecided, *and* in ſuſpenſe *during this Life*: I have found the word *Undecided* in my *Goſpel-Truth ſtated*, pag. 61. which I then was ignorant of,

SECT. III.

though I caſt my eye on the bottom of that very Page. My words are, "The Covenant, though conditional, is a diſpoſition of Grace. There's Grace in giving ability to perform the condition, as well as in beſtowing the benefits: God's enjoining one in order to the other, makes not the benefit to be leſs of Grace; but it is a diſplay of God's wiſdom, in conferring the benefit, ſuitably to the nature and *ſtate of men in this life*, whoſe eternal condition is *not eternally decided*, but are in a ſtate of trial; yea, the conditions are but a meetneſs to receive the bleſſings." But as I have ſhewn in my Anſwer, *pag.* 184. *& ſeq.* that I oft in *Goſpel-Truth ſtated*, affirm, That the Elect *ſhall perſevere* in Faith, and that every true Saint is *now* in a ſtate of Salvation: So I ſhall only add, (1.) I do not here mention *believers*, but *men* in general, yea, rather unbelievers. (2.) By *eternally decided* any man may ſee, that I had an eye only to God's *judicial deciſion* at Death, and the more ſolemn Sentence at the laſt Judgment; when we die, our warfare is finiſhed, and our State, as *Viatores*, is at an end. And, (3.) What mean all the Scripture *Cautions*, (even to believers,) ſuch as, *Watch*, &c. *Paſs the time of your ſojourning here in Fear*, &c. if all our State be *decided ſo*, while we have many years, temptations, and perſevering work before us; *as* it will be beyond the grave?

grave? Alas, how many are long deceived by the mere *form of Godlineſs?* and they that are *godly*, are called to *caution* and *care*, on this very conſideration, that *they are to be judged*; (1 Pet. i. 17.) which were uſeleſs to ſuch as are in *termino*. 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8. Rev. ii. 10. See more in my Anſwer to the Second Charge. SECT. III.

THE Point of the *Embrio* was not fit for my large inſiſting on; or I could have proved, that an *Embrio* is not *an unformed unorganized maſs, or lump*, &c.

AN

AN
ANSWER
TO
Mr. *John Humfrey*'s
SECOND
PRINTED LETTER,
Wherein he publiſheth
Mr. *LOBB*'s Objections
AGAINST
Mr. *WILLIAMS*'s Books.

Printed in the Year 1695.

A N S W E R

TO

Mr. John Humfrys

SECOND

PRINTED LETTER,

Wherein he publishes

Mr. LOBB's Objections

AGAINST

Mr. WILLIAMS's Books.

Printed in the Year 1695.

AN

ANSWER

TO

Mr. *John Humfrey*'s

SECOND

Printed Letter, &c.

SIR,

YOUR First Letter misrepresents my Judgment in many things, as if you little considered my Books, from whence you pretend your Objections. This Letter I suffer to pass without further animadversion, than to inform you, that my Adversaries have boldly assured the world, that I say, "The Righteousness of Christ is imputed *only as to effects*;" whereas you truly represent my words, "that *besides the effects*, the Righteousness of Christ itself "is imputed to us." It is true, you had prevented your Plea against it, had you consulted *Man made Righteous*, pag. 88,—92. Yet have I no reason to complain of my Treatment; whilst struck at by both Extreams,

Extreams, when deeper thoughts would perceive the Truth ſtated againſt the exceſs of both.

BUT your Second Letter neceſſitates a Vindication of my ſelf from the Falſhoods impoſed on you; the publication whereof is poorly excuſed by ſaying, *You have not my Books now to examine the Quotations.* Will your Experience allow you to be a Tool to a man you call *learned?* becauſe *induſtrious* to divide Brethren, under a pretence of reconciling a Breach, which is made and maintained to ſerve a turn, againſt all the ſelf-denying methods that were poſſible on our part. This Sheet allows not arguing any point; my concern is to ſhew, how unjuſtly I am repreſented by the Objections offered by your Author.

I Obj. *Chriſt, where he is called a Surety, was the Surety of a better Covenant, and therefore not of the Law of works: It was not the Covenant that obliged us to die for ſin, or perfectly to obey in a way of merit, of which he is called a Surety.* Man made Righteous, *pag.* 117.

Anſ. [1.] HE leaves out the word *here*, and ſo changeth the ſenſe. My words are, "The Covenant of which he is ſaid to "be the Surety *here*," viz. *Heb.* vii. 22.

[2.] IN ſtating the Queſtion that leads to theſe words, *(pag.* 104. *& ſeq.)* I declared, what I affirmed concerning Chriſt's *Suretiſhip*, and what I did deny. (1.) I granted,

granted, that "Chriſt hath undertaken in "the Covenant of Redemption, that he "would make Satisfaction to Juſtice for "us, and obey the whole Will of God, "*&c.* He was *a real Sponſor*, engaging "to do all that belonged to him. Chriſt "accordingly died in our Nature, and that "not only for our good, but in our ſtead, "*noſtro loco.* We were liable to die, but "he ſtept in and died, that we might not "die; who otherwiſe muſt have died, "but now live by his dying for us. He "was a proper ἀντίψυχος, he gave his Life "*for ours*; yea, and this to vindicate the "glory of God, in exempting us from "death, *&c.*" Then I proved, "that "Chriſt did ſuffer *properly in our ſtead*, "was a Sacriſice for us, *&c.*" And concluded, "Thus far the Word of God directs "us to call Chriſt, either *Surety*, *Sponſor*, "*Repreſentative*, &c." But, (2.) The thing that I *denied*, was, "That Chriſt "by his obedience made atonement, or "merited for us, as *a proper pecuniary Sure-*"*ty in the Law of works.*" This I confuted by ſeveral Arguments; and the words objected are the *ſixth* Argument, *viz.* "That in *Heb.* vii. 22. where Chriſt is "called *a Surety*, it is *of a better Cove-*"*nant*; which is *not the Covenant of works.*" Sir, judge you, whether I affirm not Chriſt to be *a Surety*, name and thing; though I affirm, that it is *a better Covenant he is*

called

called Surety of, in Heb. vii. 22. and deny him to be *a Money-Surety.*

II Obj. *Christ can be bound by the Covenant, of which he is Surety, to no more than what we are engaged to do and suffer by the Gospel-Covenant.* Man made Righteous, *pag.* 122.

Ans. My words are, "The Covenant "Christ is Surety of *in this place*, [viz. "*Heb.* vii. 22.] is the Gospel-Covenant; "and *if so*, he can even as a *Money*-Sure-"ty *hereby* be bound with us to no more, "than what we are engaged to do and suf-"fer by this Gospel-Covenant: It is true, "by the Covenant of Redemption, he "was engaged to suffer death in the human "nature for Satisfaction, and this in our "place, and also to obey the whole Law." Sir, can you not see that the Objector leaves out, *in this place*, *Money*, and *hereby?* and he also makes that to be my Assertion, what I only infer from a Supposition, which I denied, and leaves out *if so.* He would suggest me to say, *Christ is to repent and believe for us*; which as I expressly deny, *pag.* 105. so I oft declare, that his *Suretiship*, as to the Gospel-Covenant, consists in his undertaking that the Covenant shall be performed on God's, and on the Believer's part. And lastly, he stops just at the words which confute his whole Imputation, *viz.* "That Christ was

"engaged

" engaged by the Covenant of Redemp-
" tion to ſuffer death, *&c.*"

III Obj. *Though in* Gal. iv. 4, 5. *it is ſaid, that Chriſt was made under the Law, it is not meant of the Moral Law, but the Ceremonial Law.* Ibid. *pag.* 127.

Anſ. I was proving, " that though the
" Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, for which we
" are juſtified, be a Righteouſneſs adequate
" to the Law, yea, *ſupra-legal*, as well as
" in ſubſtance truly legal; yet that Right-
" eouſneſs is not a *Suretiſhip-righteouſneſs*,
" that can infer us *equally righteous* as
" Chriſt." Purſuant hereto I conſider *Gal.* iv. 4, 5. as an Objection, to which I anſwer, among other things, " That the
" Context confines this to the following
" ſenſe, *viz.* that Chriſt was made under
" the *Jewiſh Law*, delivered Four hun-
" dred years after the Promiſe, *&c.* And
" in this ſenſe, it is not the Law of Inno-
" cency, as a *proper Covenant of works*,
" &c." The Objection is pretended hence; but I ſaid, the *Jewiſh Law*, not the *Ceremonial Law*, which is but part of it: The *Moral Law* was alſo a part thereof, though not *delivered* to them as a proper Covenant of Innocency. My next Anſwer, and in the very ſame page, was, " I grant, that
" Chriſt in taking our nature, became a
" Servant, and was thus ſubject to *the*
" *Law of Innocency*, to its *precepts*, and its
" *puniſhments*, as a Mediator, according

" to the terms adjusted in the Covenant of " Redemption." Here I affirmed, what he saith I deny. My *fourth* Answer was, " Christ did not then become a Surety, " or an undertaker to die for us, by being " made under the Law; but he was *made* " *under the Law*, because he had under- " taken to die for us. His very *being* " *made under the Law of works*, was but " the performance of a *previous engagement* " to the Law-giver; this being one *Article* " in the Covenant of Redemption, That " he should take our nature, and be a " *Servant under the Law*, and make his " Soul an Offering for Sin."

IV Obj. *Calling God Creditor, and Sin a Debt, is metaphorical; and using such words as proper, hath given advantage to the* Socinians.

Ans. I acknowledge it; and such as understand the way of confuting the *Socinians*, are of the same mind; and therefore grant, that if God were a *Creditor*, and Sin a *Debt*, God might *forgive without Satisfaction*; and if the *Idem* be paid, it's not a Satisfaction, nor is there room for Pardon, nor for Gospel-terms. See this urged by *Leideker*, in his *Synopsis Theol. lib.* iv. *cap.* 6. §. 4,—7, 11, 20, 45. by Bishop *Stillingfleet*, of the *Sufferings of Christ*, chap. 1. by *Grotius*, *de Satisfact.* pag. 60, 71. and by *Essenius*, *Trium. Crucis*, pag. 340, 390. Dr. *Owen*, of *Satisfact.* pag. 141. saith,

" They

" They are the *moſt improper expreſſions* " in this matter."

V Obj. *There is no Change of Perſon between Chriſt and the Elect, or between him and Believers.* Goſpel-Truth, *pag.* 41, 45.

Anſ. [1.] If by *Change of Perſon* be meant ſimply a change of perſons or men; that is, that Sinners were to die for their tranſgreſſions, but Chriſt, by God's appointment, and his own conſent, was *ſubſtituted to obey and die in Sinners ſtead*; and that Chriſt ſtood obliged ſo to obey and ſuffer what for ſubſtance the Law required; I have hundreds of times aſſerted it in my Books. I have not room to inſtance. See in *Man made Righteous*, eight Propoſitions clearing this: In one I ſay, (*pag.* 12.) " Divine Grace and Sovereignty exert " themſelves to anſwer the ends of the " Law, by *ſubſtituting Chriſt* a Saviour of " loſt Souls."

[2.] The *Change of Perſon* which I there denied, is only that, which Dr. *Criſp* and his Followers aſſert, and which is the ſtrict meaning of a Change of Perſon, *viz.* a mutual compleat change of condition and character; and not a transferring a Puniſhment from a criminal to an hoſtage. This is evident,

(1.) By the *Error* I there confute, *viz.* " that every Elect perſon is as righteous " as Chriſt; and that there is a perfect " change of perſon and condition between

" Christ and the Elect; that *he was* what " *we are*, and we are what he was, *viz.* " *perfectly holy*, &c. Christ himself is not " so compleatly righteous, but we are *as* " *righteous as he*; nor we so compleatly " sinful, but Christ became *as sinful as we*, " &c. That very *Sinfulness* that we were, " Christ is made that very Sinfulness be- " fore God: So that there is *a direct* " *Change of Person*"

(2.) It is plain that I denied this Change of Person in Dr. *Crisp*'s sense, by what I offered to overthrow it; wherein nothing oppoſeth Christ's *dying in our ſtead*, by God's Subſtitution or Surrogation. My words are, *pag.* 45. " Christ was the *Sa-* " *viour*; we are the *ſaved*, and not the ſa- " viours: Christ was the *Redeemer*, and ne- " ver the redeemed; we are the *redeemed*, " and never the redeemers: Christ was he, " who by his merits *forgives* us, but never " was forgiven; we are *forgiven*, and ne- " ver had merits of our own to forgive our " ſelves or others: He was the dying *Sa-* " *crifice*."

(3.) I do in the very Chapter whence the words are objected, oft aſſert as much, as the Orthodox intend by Christ's being *ſubſtituted in our place* to die for us. To inſtance a few of many: *Pag.* 43. " Christ's " ſufferings and obedience were *ſo in our* " *ſtead*, that God cannot exact from us any " *other atonement* for Sin, or meriting

" *price*

" *price* of any Goſpel-bleſſings." *Pag.* 47, 48. " The efficient merit of Juſtifica-
" tion is in Chriſt; the effect of the judi-
" cial abſolution for that merit is in us:
" Had not he obeyed and ſuffered *for us*,
" we *could not* have been abſolved *for the*
" *ſake* of his obedience and ſufferings."
And *pag.* 57. " Chriſt ſuffered *in our ſtead*,
" that the fruit of his ſuffering might be
" our deliverance from ſuffering, and our
" being ſaved at laſt." How many might I add out of that very Chapter?

It is worth the Objector's leiſure to conſider, how he lays ſuch ſtreſs on a Change of Perſon in Dr. *Criſp*'s ſenſe, and yet contends for Chriſt and us being *one legal Perſon*. How could Chriſt and we be *one Perſon in Law*, and yet Chriſt's Perſon and our Perſons be conſidered as mutually *changed* in Law, unleſs that both Perſons were changed from what they once were, into a *tertium quid*, that neither were before?

VI Obj. *There is a change of the Penal Sanction of the Law:* Preface to Goſpel-Truth. *The Goſpel doth not denounce Death for the ſame Sins, and for every Sin, as* Adam's *Law did.* Defence of Goſp. Truth, *pag.* 379, 380.

Anſ. [1.] The firſt Clauſe is falſely repreſented: I will recite my words. After I had ſaid, *Pref.* pag. ix. " that the Goſ-
" pel includes the *moral preceptive part* of

" the first Law, *&c.* and that the Gof-
" pel is taken in a large sense, when I say,
" it includes all the moral precepts; but
" yet the Gospel doth so, and they are the
" Commands of a *Redeemer*, as well as the
" Law of a *Creator*:" I then added, " The
" *Gospel hath another Sanction* to the pre-
" ceptive part of the Law, than the *Cove-*
" *nant of works* had: Though nothing be
" abated in the *Rule* of sin and duty, yet
" Blessings are *promised* to lower degrees
" of duties; and a continuance in a state
" of death, with a Bar to the Blessing, are
" *not threatned* against *every degree* of Sin,
" as the Covenant of works did: Doth it
" threaten damnation, or a continuance
" therein, on any true, penitent, believ-
" ing, godly man, because he is imper-
" fect?" Sir, judge you, Is a *Change of the Penal Sanction of the moral Law*, the same as, the *Gospel hath another Sanction* to the preceptive part of the Law, as those Precepts are *taken into the Gospel?* May not *the Law* have *its own Sanction* still, as a Covenant of works? and yet *the Gospel* have *another Sanction*, as a Covenant of Grace, though it includes the moral precepts as a Rule of duty? It seems the Objector thinks with his Associates, either the Gospel hath neither precept, threatning, nor conditional promise; or if it hath *a Sanction*, it is this, That though a man be a sincere penitent Believer, yet he shall

die

die if he be guilty of one evil thought, and ſhall not be ſaved if he be not perfect.

[2.] As to the ſecond Clauſe, my words were, "The Goſpel doth not denounce "death for the *ſame Sins*, as *Adam*'s Law "did: That Law threatened death for the "*leaſt* Sin, yea, for *one* Sin; but the Goſ-"pel threatens death, not for *every* Sin; "it *doth not bar every Sinner from actual* "*relief, but the impenitent, unbelieving,* "*and utterly ungodly Hypocrite; and it* "*binds not damnation on us, unleſs we are* "*finally impenitent Unbelievers.*" But the Objector wiſely leaves out the laſt part, to traduce me by the firſt.

VII Obj. *Chriſt purchaſed the Covenant of Grace.*

Anſ. I SPEAK not of God's Decree or Purpoſe, but of the actual promulgated Promiſe to the world, that *he that believeth ſhall be ſaved*: And I can as ſoon think, God might perform this Promiſe, without reſpect to Chriſt's merits; as not provide for the Glory of his Juſtice by Chriſt's ſatisfaction, in the making this Promiſe.

VIII Obj. *The Condition of the Covenant of Grace, is an antecedent Condition.*

Anſw. MY words, in *Goſpel-Truth*, *pag.* 60. which are quoted from Mr. *Flavel*, are, "An antecedent Condition ſig-"nifies no more, than an Act of ours; "which though it be neither perfect in "every degree, nor in the leaſt meritorious

" of the benefit conferred, nor perform-
" ed in our own natural ſtrength; yet,
" according to the conſtitution of the Co-
" venant, it is required of us, in order to
" the bleſſings *conſequent thereupon* by vir-
" tue of the Promiſe." You ſee, I mean only antecedent to *ſubſequent benefits* according to the Goſpel conſtitution, but do not ſpeak of Election.

But, Sir, you omit one part of the Objection, *viz.* that I ſhould ſay, *the Conditions are legal*, &c. I never call them ſo. Nay, *pag.* 63. I affirmed, " that the
" Conditions of the Covenant of Grace *dif-*
" *fer* from the Conditions of the Covenant
" of works," and proved it in five inſtances; one whereof is, " that the bleſſings
" of the Covenant of Grace, are *merely of*
" *Grace*; they be *for another's ſake*, and
" not our own; *&c.*"

IX Obj. *Faith and Repentance are not Covenant Benefits.*

Anſw. He does not pretend to cite any place out of my Books for this, and I never wrote any ſuch thing. But I have ſaid, *Goſpel-Truth*, pag. 67. " God hath
" *promiſed*, and Chriſt engaged in the Co-
" venant of Redemption, that the Elect
" *ſhall* believe." And *pag.* 68. " The
" *firſt Grace* by which we are enabled to
" perform the Condition, is *abſolutely* given." Again, *pag.* 271. " Chriſt *purchaſed* all
" Grace for us, and by his Spirit worketh

" all

" all Grace in us." And, *pag.* 73. " There " is a *promiſe* of the *firſt Grace* made to " Chriſt, and by virtue of that promiſe " the Elect do conſent to the Covenant." Now Sir, compare all theſe things, and judge, whether your Author deſerveth ſuch truſt, as to adventure your publication of theſe things upon his credit. Sincerity inclineth you to be too credulous for ſome Aſſociates. But I proceed to the other Objections your Author makes, though he never vouchſafed me a Copy of what he gave to many others privately.

X Obj. *The Father was never diſpleaſed with Chriſt.* Goſpel-Truth, *pag.* 34.

Anſw. I AFFIRM expreſsly in that very Chapter, *pag.* 36. " that the *Soul* of " Chriſt endured the effects of *God's wrath* " againſt Sin, and was amazed thereat;" though *the Father was never diſpleaſed with Chriſt*, " nor could he be abhorred or " odious to God, for in him God was al- " ways *well pleaſed*;" as I ſhew afterwards, *pag.* 37. It ſeems the Objector would have me ſay with Dr. *Criſp*, that Chriſt was *odious to God*, hated worſe than *a Toad*, &c. on account of the *filthineſs of ſin* upon him.

XI Obj. *All Communications of Comfort could not be interrupted, whilſt the Perſonal Union remained.* Ibid. *pag.* 37.

Anſw. MY words are, " This Union " could not be diſſolved; nor could all " com-

" communications of comfort *or ſtrength* " from the divine nature be interrupted, " while the Union remained." He leaves out, *or ſtrength*, and changeth a disjunctive Propoſition into an abſolute. I diſtinguiſh between the *arbitrary* communications of comfort, and thoſe which were *neceſſary* to Chriſt's hope, truſt, peace of conſcience as to his own Innocency, to his holineſs, ſtrength, and the prevention of deſpair: What degrees of *comfort* were neceſſary to theſe, I affirm, were not interrupted.

XII Obj. *Chriſt and we are not one* in conſpectu fori; *and therefore he tells us, that 'tis Blaſphemy to debaſe him among the number of Tranſgreſſors.* Goſpel-Truth, *pag.* 46.

Anſw. [1.] NOT one *in conſpectu fori*, is not in any of my Books. The words partly cited, are part of my argument, againſt the *Criſpian* Change of Perſon, whereby *we are as righteous* as Chriſt, and *he as ſinful* as we: They are theſe; " It " is profane *arrogance* for us to pretend to " Chriſt's Prerogatives; and it is *blaſphemy* " to debaſe Chriſt among Enemies and " Sinners, for whom he was the dying " Sacrifice: It is enough, that he, reſerv- " ing the *peculiars of a Redeemer*, ſhould " agree to ſuffer for our Sins; it is enough, " that we are pardoned and adopted *for* " *his ſake*, who deſerved endleſs woe, and " are never capable of making the leaſt " atonement."

[2.] IF

[2.] If the Objector pretends to repreſent me, as denying *the guilt of Sin* being once *upon Chriſt*; he knows, I plainly ſtate and affirm the contrary. *Pag.* 8. "Our "Sins were imputed to Chriſt, with re- "ſpect to *the guilt thereof*; ſo that he, by "the Father's appointment, and his own "conſent, became obliged, as Mediator, "to bear the puniſhment of our Iniqui- "ties; and he did *bear thoſe puniſhments*, "to the full ſatisfaction of Juſtice." And, *pag.* 10. "Chriſt did bear *the guilt* of our "Sins, which is that reſpect of Sin to the "*threatning* of the Law, whereby there is "an obligation to bear the puniſhment."

[3.] I suppose the Objector is *now* offended, that I did not ſay with Dr. *Criſp* and his Party, that *Sin it ſelf*, the very filth and fault, the ἀνομια as oppoſed to the guilt, was laid on Chriſt; and that on this account he was in God's eſteem *the very murtherer* and *Idolater*.

[4.] I grant, that God eſteemed Chriſt and Sinners as *one*; as he that freely engageth to die to redeem Sinners, by dying *in their ſtead*, and they in whoſe ſtead he ſo dieth, *are one*. But I ſhall ever deny, that Chriſt and Sinners were ſo one *in conſpectu fori*, as that God eſteemed Sinners to die to make ſatisfaction; tho' they, when Believers, are ſaved by Chriſt's death, as if they had made atonement: And alſo, that Chriſt was *the Sinner* in God's account,

account, when he died ſuſtaining the perſon of a Mediator.

XIII Obj. *Mr.* Williams *differs from himſelf, having in his Writings ſeveral inconſiſtencies and ſelf-contradictions.*

Anſw. [1.] THIS is put in for a proviſion againſt all that occurs in my Books, to debar the falſe Charge againſt me: Oh *he contradicts himſelf*, when he utters things in fulleſt oppoſition to *Socinianiſm*, &c.

[2.] AND wherein do I *contradict myſelf?* The Objector thinks, If I deny the *Criſpian* Change of Perſon, or *pecuniary Suretiſhip*, and *one legal Perſon*, in a ſenſe inferring our making Satisfaction by our own dying in the Law's eſtimate; then whatever I ſay of Chriſt's Satisfaction, muſt be *Socinianiſm*; and all I can utter againſt *Socinianiſm*, is ſelf-contradicting. But if he call me to it, I ſhall demonſtrate, that Chriſt being a Mediator, Sponſor, or ſubſequent Surety *ex re geſtâ*, conſtituted ſuch by the Covenant of Redemption, and made under the Law, purſuant to that prior engagement to obey and ſuffer *in our ſtead* what anſwered the ends of the Law, that we might be ſaved in a way conſiſtent with God's glory as our Law-giver; will argue as great a *Change of Perſons*, and *Suretiſhip*, as will ſolve his feigned contradictions. And yet I ſhall deny ſuch a *compleat Change of Perſon*, as argues Chriſt to be *the Sinner*, and the redeemed to be *as right-*

righteous as Chriſt; and in like manner ſhall deny ſuch a *legal oneneſs* and ſtrict *pecuniary Suretiſhip*, as argues, that we paid all our own Debts, that we ſatisfied the Law by obeying its precepts and enduring its penalty, and ſo the Law of works, not the Goſpel, abſolves us. You may ſee the point partly ſtated, at the cloſe of my *Defence of Goſpel-Truth*. As to what he ſaith, of my *pretending an agreement with ſome modern Divines, who diſagree with me*; I am ſure, I have truly recited their own words, which ſo far expreſs my ſentiments; let him prove them ſelf-contradictors if he can.

His flying Charge from the premiſes, as if *Socinianiſm* were abetted, deſerves no farther reply, than to call it *ſlanderous*. All my arguments againſt Chriſt's *pecuniary Suretiſhip*, he never read *in any Book*; and had a *Socinian* urged them againſt a *Truth*, they are not the leſs valid if urged againſt *Errors* deſtructive to Chriſtianity. And what if ſome *Socinians* uſe ſome Expreſſions, in a ſenſe contrary to that wherein I plainly uſe them? They do alſo own a *Commutation of Perſon*; and then *they* muſt be *Socinians* by as ſtrong a conſequence, who uſe that phraſe. If I have not in my Books ſaid enough to clear me from all ſuſpicion of that Error, the Objector's malice muſt be the ſtandard of *Socinianiſm*, and not the fundamental poſitions,

tions, which have by all its celebrated oppoſers been hitherto confuted. To omit *Chriſt's eternal Generation* as the Son of God, of one Eſſence with the Father, which I oft aſſert; Could I ſay more as to *his Satisfaction*, than I have *ex profeſſo* done, and oft with enforcing reaſons? See *Man made Righteous*, pag. 8, 10,—18, 40,--45, 272, &c. I place the *neceſſity* of Satisfaction in God's *eſſential Juſtice*: I deſcribe it, by Chriſt's perfectly obeying the Law of works in its eſſentials, and doing much more; as alſo, in his ſuffering death *in our ſtead*: I aſſert *his Sufferings* to be *Puniſhments* ſatisfactory *to Juſtice* for our Sins; that Chriſt was a *proper Sacrifice*, and himſelf the *Prieſt* that offereth it *on earth*: I make *his Obedience* properly *meritorious* of all our ſaving benefits, and himſelf a proper ἀντίψυχος in his death; with much more, which I challenge him to prove conſiſtent with *Socinianiſm*. But ſome men think, they can gain a point among their credulous ſilly Admirers, by branding with a *ſcandalous name* all they bear an ill will to, if not affright the Perſons injured, or at leaſt their Friends. But I bleſs God, I have found more of his defence, and am more aſſured of the goodneſs of my cauſe, than to be *affrighted* from my duty by ſuch Bug-bears: And ſhould all they of the *ſame judgment with me* expoſe the truth by

by little arts and trimming methods, in pretence of deſigns never ſo plauſible, I ſhall have peace, when my teſtimony is faithfully given, as occaſion ſhall offer, by whatever implacable rage I am purſued.

I CONCLUDE, Sir, blaming your Credulity in printing things as mine, before examination; though in moſt you declare your ſelf to be of my ſide, and in the reſt farther from my Enemies. Nor perceive I your Author's *ſelf-denial*, or *peaceableneſs*; unleſs you think, becauſe I have been ſo injured, therefore I muſt ſtill by farther ſuffering juſtify the injurious; and bear the name of a *hinderer of the Union*, becauſe they who *never were of it*, perſecute me for my diligence in making, and my care to preſerve that *Union*, againſt their various and unwearied attempts *from the firſt* to break it. And let me tell you, that as they reſted not, till by their Errors, noiſe of Doctrines, and other arts, they had gained ſeveral to make this breach; ſo a Compliance, even to the allowing their Errors, and ſacrificing the Truth to their luſts, would be inſignificant to bring ſuch into the *Union*, who refuſed it long before any of my Books were written; or firmly reſtore ſuch, who by their influence deſerted it; unleſs God give a Spirit, that ſhall prefer publick good to little deſigns, and incline to Love and Peace, above diviſion and wrath. Experience of the unſuc-

unſucceſsfulneſs of many overtures for Peace, (a narrative whereof would amaze the world,) induceth this Conjecture: And yet no hardſhips I have endured, ſhall abate a deſire of a ſolid Union upon honeſt terms. You will find, that Dr. *Bates*, Mr. *Howe*, and Mr. *Alſop*, deſign no more, than what is agreeable to what I affirm, and that they hate the Errors I oppoſe. Theſe Errors, though ſo dangerous, Mr. *Lobb* for Party-ſake will promote, by blaſting my confutation of them, and preſſing an implicit diſowning my Books, as a *term of Union* with thoſe, who rejected it as *ſinful*, long before my Books were written; yea, who influenced the dividing of *Pinner's-Hall* Lecture, to break the *Fund* for poor Miniſters; that both theſe added to their ſtated ſeparate Meeting of Miniſters, (at the ſame hour the united Brethren met,) a perfect Breach might be proclaimed: And for a Grave-ſtone over it, the only four Paſtors in *London*, who never came into the *Union*, are with two more the only Lecturers at *Pinner's-Hall*. Could then the Subſcribers to my Book be ſo falſe to Truth and their Miniſtry, as to abate their Teſtimony, will a *general Union* enſue? No, unleſs the *Diſſenters* former Declaration againſt it were a *Trick*. Why then is it ſo inſiſted on? It's becauſe it will not be yielded to, and ſo they get an Excuſe long *after* this Subſcription, why they united

united not *before* it: Or if complied with, then beſides a countenance to their Errors, men will judge, the *Preſbyterians* cauſe theſe Diviſions; although they aſk nothing of the *Diſſenters*, but to meet with them, and be quiet: And laſtly, the Engliſh and Foreign Churches would affix the *Criſpian dotages* to the *Preſbyterians*, for thus revoking their Teſtimony againſt them; a Cenſure of which ſort, on a lighter occaſion, was going into the preſs, juſt as my Book ſo ſubſcribed came out.

I am,

Your Brother and Servant,

DAN. WILLIAMS.

THE ANSWER TO THE *REPORT, &c.*

Which the

United Miniſters

Appointed their

COMMITTEE to draw up.

ALSO

LETTERS of the Right Reverend the Biſhop of *Worceſter*, and the Reverend Dr. *Edwards*, to Mr. *Williams*; againſt whom their Teſtimony was produced by Mr. *Lobb*.

AND

Animadverſions on Mr. *LOBB's Defence of the Report*.

Printed in the Year 1698.

THE
ANSWER
TO THE
REPORT &c.
of the
United Ministers
COMMITTEE to draw up,
AND
A VINDICATION
of the Right Reverend
the Bishop of Derry, and the Reverend Dr. Adam, &c. from Mr. Williams's
ungrateful observations. Published by the Authority of the Committee.
AND
An Address to the Members of the Associations.

Printed in the Year 1698.

THE

PREFACE.

I SHAL give a true Narrative of the compoſing and publiſhing of the following Sheets. The *United Miniſters*, after their uſual receſs, met at *St. Helen's*, *Sept.* 6. 1697. After previous debates, it was unanimouſly voted, "That the *Com-*
"*mittee* ſhould take notice of the Papers
"called, *The Report*, and *the Remarks*;
"and if any Brother had any thing to of-
"fer about the ſame, that he ſhould com-
"municate it to them, in order to their
"drawing up an *Anſwer*." The Committee conſiſts of Dr. *Bates*, Mr. *Hammond*, Mr. *Howe*, Mr. *Alſop*, Mr. *Williams*, Mr. *Stretton*, Mr. *Woodhouſe*, Mr. *Spademan*, and Mr. *Nath. Taylor*.

Sept. 20. 1697. "The *Anſwer* of the
"Committee *to the Report*, &c. was read,
"and ordered to be read a ſecond time
"next *Monday*." Note, (1.) They of the Committee, who applied themſelves to this work, were Mr. *Hammond*, Mr. *Alſop*, Mr. *Williams*, Mr. *Stretton*, Mr. *Woodhouſe*, Mr. *Spademan*, and Mr. *Nath. Taylor*. Six of them ſeverally peruſed this *An-*

ſwer to the Report; and after ſeveral Meetings, all the Seven unanimouſly agreed thereto, and brought it to the Meeting as the *Anſwer* they had prepared. The moſt material parts were read to Dr. *Bates*, (particularly, the Propoſal, *pag.* 359, & *ſeq.* the account of the Subſcription to the *Firſt Paper*, and concerning my Book, *pag.* 379, 380. &c.) and approved of by him. Our Rule is, "that no matter of moment "ſhall be determined, unleſs it hath been "openly and freely debated and agreed "to in one Meeting, and then re-aſſumed "and concluded in a Second Meeting." (2.) This *Anſwer* was debated and agreed to in this Meeting; though a Brother had objected againſt its being *in the name* of the Body.

Sept. 27. 1697. "RESOLVED, that the "reading of the *Anſwer to the Report* be "deferred to this day fortnight, that the "*Committee* may have time to conſider." Note, (1.) The occaſion of this delay, was not any thing objected againſt any part of this *Anſwer*: But three of the Brethren inſiſted, that it was too great a condeſcenſion in the Body, to anſwer ſo inſignificant a perſon as the *Author of the Report*; that this preſent *Anſwer* ſhould be publiſhed by a particular Brother; and that ſome inconveniency might attend putting forth *any Anſwer* in the name of the Body. (2.) The thing to be conſidered by the *Committee* was,

was, what expedient could be offered, or reaſon given, why *this Anſwer* ſhould not be publiſhed in the name of the *united Miniſters* as ſuch. (3.) The *Committee* met, and debated: But one of the foreſaid three Brethren remaining unſatisfied, that *any Anſwer* ſhould be printed *in the name* of the Body of the *united Miniſters*, the Debate was put off to another time.

October 11. 1697. "Mr. *Hammond* ac-"quainted the Brethren, that the *Commit-*"*tee* was not ready to give in their Re-"port." Upon ſome of the Brethren beginning to expreſs their reſentments at theſe delays, I ſpake to this effect: "Mr. *Mo-*"*derator*, Though I have met with no "reaſon, that is cogent with me, or with "many of the Brethren, why any be "unwilling, the *Anſwer* ſhould be pub-"liſhed *in the name* of the Body of the "*united Miniſters*; yet the diſſatisfaction "of any worthy Brother, *&c.* is ſo incon-"venient at this juncture, that I ſhall not "inſiſt on the preſent reading of *our An-*"*ſwer* here:—But I ſhall acquaint you, "that ſome or other of the Brethren will "cauſe this *Anſwer* to be printed, with an "account how far it hath proceeded a-"mong us." This proved a ſatisfying expedient, of which no man expreſſed any diſlike. Hereupon a Vote, which paſſed *nemine contradicente*, *Sept.* 27. 1697. (when all were preſent, who deſired further time

to conſider whether the *Anſwer* ſhould be *in the name* of all the *united Miniſters*,) was now repeated and unanimouſly approved: The Vote was, "We judge it needful, "that there be an *Anſwer* to two Papers, "called *the Report* and *the Remarks*, in "vindication of the *united Miniſters* from "the Charge therein made againſt them."

THUS far, and no further, did this *Anſwer to the Report* proceed in our Meeting of Miniſters: Nor did I keep it a ſecret, when in the Preſs; but moſt of the Brethren were informed thereof, whereat none expreſſed (that I know of) any diſſatisfaction. As for *the Epiſtle*, with which the Anſwer to the Report is introduced, and *the Reflections on the Remarks* that follow it, they went no further than the *Committee*, and were not to be brought to the Meeting till after the *Anſwer* had paſt.

THOUGH this Narrative informs you, that this *Anſwer* is not publiſhed *in the name* of the Body of the *united Miniſters*; becauſe the Confirmation of it by a ſecond reading is *ſuſpended*, and only ſo: Yet the original Papers, and the matters of Fact declared, are as unqueſtionable, and the Doctrines herein acknowledged are as much their common ſentiments, as if the *Anſwer* had been publiſhed *in the name* of the Body. For I appeal to the Book of *St. Helen's*, for the truth of this Narrative; and to the Copy peruſed and marked by the *Committee*, that

that there is no Change in the *Anſwer to the Report*, except one amendment in the date of time; nor in the *Epiſtle*, or *Reflections on the Remarks*, beſides one expreſſion ſoftned by the Committee's direction.

COULD the Anſwer of a particular Brother, as well expreſs the *Doctrines* aſſented to by the *united Miniſters*, and obtain the ſame credit in a recital of *matters of Fact*, (in both which lies their Vindication,) as this *Anſwer*, [which their *Committee* was appointed to draw, and which they brought in to the Meeting as their prepared Anſwer, and which was *once agreed to* by the Body, and unexcepted againſt in any one paſſage, when it was *ſuſpended* to gratify three of the Brethren;] I ſhould have preferred the liberty of anſwering alone, if I had not judged it needleſs after ſo great an Anſwer as *the Faithful Rebuke*, which was ſo acceptable, that only the modeſty of the Author prevented the thanks of the *united Miniſters*, for his putting a ſtop to the evil effects of *the Report*, whilſt their Meetings were diſcontinued.

I HAVE ſubjoined that *Second Paper*, mentioned in *the Report*, &c. As alſo one of the *Letters* of the Right Reverend the Lord Biſhop of *Worceſter*, and one of the Reverend Dr. *Edwards*; both whoſe Books Mr. *Lobb* cites againſt me; and therefore I thought none fitter, to vindicate me againſt his

his Charge, and their own Books from the ill uſe he wreſted them to ſerve.

LASTLY, Mr. *Lobb's Defence of the Report*, with a challenge to me, coming forth when theſe were in the Preſs, friendſhip and juſtice to the *Rebuker* prompted my beſtowing a few hours to ſtop the ill effects of this *grand piece of art and miſrepreſentation*, (for it is nothing elſe,) until *he* ſhall better ſift, and more expoſe it: And one thing I hint, which I thought proper for him to overlook. If after all this Evidence Mr. *Lobb* can find a people ſo credulous and bewitched by prejudice, as to ſay, That the *united Miniſters*, or myſelf, are *Socinians*; that the difference on our part (tho' it is ſo on theirs,) hath been about mere words or trifles; that we have oppoſed any thing but groſs *Criſpianiſm*; that we brake the *Union*, or refuſed *Re-union*, from a zeal for *Errors* againſt the Satisfaction of Chriſt, or Juſtification by his Righteouſneſs; they deſerve pity rather than argument. That at laſt Truth and Peace may prevail, is the Prayer of

Nov. 17. 1697. *Daniel Williams.*

SECT.

SECT. I.

The Answer *to the* Report, &c. *drawn up by the* Committee.

TO THE READER.

NONE are more afflicted than ourselves under those unseasonable Dissentions, which we would have concealed, when our utmost endeavours and compliances could neither prevent, nor yet put a period to them. But the Authors of the printed Papers which we confute, have contrived so to proclaim our Differences, by sending those sheets in Letters to most of our Ministers in the Kingdom, yea, to foreign parts, and to multitudes of private persons; that our Defence, instead of making our Divisions more known, will scarce reach those already mis-informed.

Had the Charge contained only small mistakes, or lesser Errors, *christian prudence might forbid an Answer: But when they publish us guilty of such destructive Opinions,*

SECT. I.

nions, as they ſay ſubvert the doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction, *yea, and make it impoſſible; and this, not as raſh Cenſurers, but pretending to cite our own Paper for their Charge; a Vindication is neceſſary, unleſs we ought to proſtitute our Miniſtry, betray the Truth, lie under the brand of Heretical Opinions, induce others by our example to entertain ſuch Errors, and confirm thoſe who are already infected.*

Had the Accuſation been ſtill confined to ſome particular Brethren, *our Practice hitherto may convince the world, we had not* as a Body *ſet forth this Vindication: But when the Authors of* the Report, &c. *accuſe all who ſent* the Third Paper, *that is, the Body of the* united Brethren *in and about* London; *nothing ſhort of our own publick Teſtimony can be ſufficient to declare what our Principles be, or acquit us from holding thoſe horrid Errors, they ſo confidently as well as falſely aſcribe unto us. A particular Brother's Defence of us would be incompetent to thoſe Ends, had any one been willing thereby to expoſe himſelf.*

And yet tho' the Reporters *write for, and pretend to give the ſenſe of, all the* diſſenting Brethren, *as well as to arraign and condemn all us the* united Miniſters; *nevertheleſs, we direct our Confutation only to the Authors of the* Report, *and of that called* Remarks, *with ſuch as conſented to and approved thereof. We are ſo far from intending*

tending any other perſons, that we hope, none beſides them will eſteem themſelves reflected on in this our Defence: Nor had we given any Narrative of the riſe and progreſs of our Differences, (leſt more might appear intended;) but that the Report and Remarks do ſo frequently declare, that our Diviſions hitherto have been cauſed only by our contending for Socinian Errors againſt Chriſt's Satisfaction. SECT. I.

We alſo deſire the Reader to obſerve, that what we call the Firſt Paper, is that which ſeveral Congregational Brethren contend for. That which we call the Third Paper, is that which the united Brethren ſent as a means of Re-union to thoſe who have left the Union. And when we term ſuch as left the Union, and approve of the Report, Diſſenters, it is not from any diſ-reſpect, but becauſe the Report chuſeth to call them by the name of diſſenting Brethren, pag. 4. And whereas once or twice we have occaſion to give a Narrative only of ſome things declared by ſome of our Brethren, we do not therein determine concerning ſuch things, further than to report that thoſe Brethren have declared ſuch things as we there mention.

With this neceſſitated Vindication of our ſelves and Miniſtry, we think it incumbent on us to warn all perſons, eſpecially ſuch of you as ſtand more peculiarly related to us; that you be not ſhaken in mind, but that

you

SECT. I. *you remain* ſtedfaſt in the Faith *in this Time, when Seducers not only abound, but under various diſguiſes are ſo unuſually active and ſucceſsful, to the reproach of Chriſtianity, and the apparent danger of the Souls ſeduced by them. Lament with us, to ſee all revealed Religion expoſed by ſome, the Godhead and Satisfaction of Chriſt our bleſſed Redeemer denied by others, and Doctrines which have a direct tendency to Libertiniſm eſpouſed by too many. All which, with the reſidue of the great Errors at this time propagated, do (however inconſiſtent they ſeem,) jointly contribute to the ſubverting of the true Religion, and threaten miſery to theſe Kingdoms.*

And as we would excite your godly Zeal for the Truths and Laws of Chriſt, againſt Opinions, ſubverting the foundations of Faith, and militating againſt practical Godlineſs: So with equal concern we muſt exhort you, to have fervent charity *towards all Chriſtians, and to* walk in peace *with all who call upon the name of the Lord out of a pure heart. Notwithſtanding differences in leſſer matters,* whereunto we have attained, let us *all* walk by the ſame Rule; *waiting with mutual forbearance, till* God ſhall reveal *thoſe things to ſuch, who at preſent are* otherwiſe minded *than our ſelves.*

PEACE

PEACE is ſo deſirable, that we have ſuffered ourſelves to be long miſrepreſented, in hopes that Time at leaſt, would ſo abate the prejudices of our *diſſenting Brethren*, (as the *Report* calls them,) as not to neceſſitate us to a publick Vindication of ourſelves. But to our grief we find, that the more we ſubmitted, the more ſome were encouraged to ſerve their own purpoſes, by expoſing us and our Miniſtry. Yet we continued paſſive, until a printed Paper, entituled, *A Report of our Differences*, (written by ſome of them, as if in the name, if not with the conſent or countenance of the reſt,) compels us at laſt, to ſtate *matters of Fact*, as they ſtand, with reſpect to *Doctrinals*, between us the *united Miniſters* in and about *London*, and ſuch as have deſerted our Union; which we can freely ſubmit to the Judgment of the unbiaſs'd Reader, altho' we forbear to mention ſeveral things, which would irritate more than thoſe we are forced to recite, for our Defence againſt the Paper we are now taking into conſideration. SECT. I.

THE Title it bears is, *A Report of the preſent State of the Differences in Doctrinals*, &c. But upon peruſal, we find it neither an impartial, clear, nor true Report of thoſe

SECT. I.

thoſe Differences: Nor can the deſign it is to ſerve be concealed, eſpecially when it is ſo induſtriouſly ſent throughout the Kingdom, to impoſe on ſuch as are unacquainted with our Caſe.

BEFORE we examine the particulars of this *Report*, it is needful to give an account of the riſe, and progreſs of our Differences; wherein it will appear, Whether we did any thing to break the Union; or omitted any thing within our power to induce thoſe Brethren to re-unite, who had ſeparated from us; or were not inclined to live in peace, when their unperſuadableneſs made us ſo unhappy, as to be deprived of their deſired Society.

ABOUT the beginning of the Year 1691. were publiſhed the *Heads of an Agreement between the Preſbyterian and Congregational Miniſters* (as then diſtinguiſh'd) *in and about London*; which were drawn up by a number deputed by thoſe of both Denominations: Of the firſt were, Mr. *Hammond*, Mr. *Howe*, Mr. *Williams*, Mr. *Stretton*, with Dr. *Anneſley* and Mr. *Mayo*, who both of them are now at reſt in the Lord: Of the other were, Mr. *Griffith*, Mr. *Mead*, Mr. *Chauncy*, Mr. *Lobb*, with Mr. *James* and Mr. *Mather*, which two alſo are now fallen aſleep in the Lord. Theſe Heads of Agreement were aſſented to (as far as we know,) by all the *Preſbyterian* and *Congregational Miniſters* then in and about *London*,

don, except Mr. *Cole*, Mr. *Mather*, and Mr. *Richard Taylor*. Among other things, we therein declared, "*First*, That we "would meet and conſult, without the "leaſt ſhadow of ſeparate or diſtinct Par- "ties. And, *Secondly*, That as to what "appertains to ſoundneſs of Judgment in "matters of Faith, we eſteem it ſufficient, "that a Church acknowledge the Scrip- "tures to be the Word of God, the perfect "and only Rule of Faith and Practice; "and own, either the Doctrinal part of the "*Articles* of the *Church of England*, or the "*Confeſſion*, or *Catechiſms*, ſhorter or larger, "compiled by the *Aſſembly* at *Weſtminſter*, "or the *Confeſſion* agreed on at the *Savoy*, "to be agreeable to the ſaid Rule."

SECT. I.

By the *firſt*, we thought our meetings of Miniſters were ſecured, and oppoſite meetings prevented. By the *latter*, we provided, that our Union ſhould not be diſſolved by every different Opinion; eſpecially ſuch, as were known to be eſpouſed by perſons when admitted Members of the Union, as the Reverend Mr. *Baxter*, Mr. *Cockain*, &c. This Union was tolerably maintained for a while, notwithſtanding the attempts of ſome to break it, (as we have reaſon to fear,) and of others to make it ſerviceable to purpoſes not fit to be mentioned.

About *October*, 1692. Mr *Chauncy*, in a meeting of the *united Miniſters*, after

SECT. I. many warm Expreſſions, declared, he would leave their meetings, and break off from their Union. The Cauſe he alledged was, our taking no cognizance of a Paper of Objections, ſubſcribed by Mr. *Griffith*, Mr. *Cole*, Mr. *Mather*, Mr. *Chauncy*, Mr. *Trayl*, and Mr. *Richard Taylor*, againſt Mr. *Williams*'s Book, called, *Goſpel-Truth ſtated, &c.* written in confutation of Dr. *Criſp*'s unſound Opinions, which had been revived and divulged by his Works re-printed; to which Book of Mr. *Williams*'s, an Approbation is prefix'd with ſeveral of our names. There were many reaſons, we ſhould take ſmall notice of thoſe Objections in our meetings; ſeeing that *three* of the *ſix* Objectors were *not of the Union*; and the material Objections were not only ungrounded, but they recited as Mr. *Williams*'s words in his Book, what we found quite contrary to the letter of his expreſſions: We might add many more.

BUT notwithſtanding we were convinced, That particular Brethren's ſubſcribing Mr. *Williams*'s confutation of Dr. *Criſp*'s Errors, (which were openly propagated to our common danger and reproach,) did not affect the Union, nor the united Miniſters *as ſuch*; and therefore could be no juſt cauſe of any Brother's deſerting us: Yet we appointed a number of the Brethren to conſider thoſe Objections againſt Mr. *Williams*'s

liams's Book, who together with the Objectors accommodated that affair, by a Subſcription to certain Doctrinal Propoſitions, of which you have an account, printed 1693. called, *An Agreement in Doctrinals*; out of which we ſhall only collect theſe paſſages. SECT. I.

Pag. 1. "WHEREAS ſome differences "have of late ariſen, occaſioned by a Book "written by Mr. *Williams*, entitled, *Goſ-* "*pel-Truth ſtated*, (wherein Dr. *Criſp*'s "Works re-printed are conſidered,) and "by certain Books written by Mr. *Chaun-* "*cy* in oppoſition thereto, and by an Ap- "probation of divers of us prefixed to Mr. "*Williams*'s Book, and by a Paper ſub- "ſcribed by Mr. *Griffith*, Mr. *Cole*, Mr. "*Mather*, Mr. *Trayl*, and Mr. *Richard* "*Taylor*, in conjunction with Mr. *Chaun-* "*cy*: It is hereby declared, that neither "they who ſubſcribed that Approbation "prefix'd to Mr. *Williams*'s Book, did "therein more than ſignify, (as their own "words expreſs,) that they judg'd he had, "in all that was material, fully and right- "ly ſtated the Truths and Errors therein "mentioned as ſuch, without delivering "their ſenſe about the Preface, Explica- "tions, or Proofs thereto belonging; which "Declaration is not to be eſteemed as a "diſapproval of the ſaid Preface, Expli- "cations, or Proofs; *&c.*" Here it is plain, that whatever ground of difference

SECT. I.

was pretended from that Book, or the Approbation to it, it was then conſidered and adjuſted; that being the very expreſs and ſole matter, which that Agreement refers to: And therefore how unaccountable is it, to maintain Diviſions ſo long after, upon that ſame pretence?

Pag. 2. WE and they ſay, "That in "order to the compoſing of matters in "Controverſy, *&c.* we do ſubſcribe theſe "following Propoſitions, as what do moſt "fully provide againſt the *Arminian*, *Antinomian*, *Socinian*, and *Popiſh* Errors, "*&c.*" Here was declared a full proviſion againſt thoſe reſpective Errors. And is it not ſtrange, that now ſuch phraſes and words muſt be the Standard of Orthodoxy, which neither this *Agreement*, the *Church of England*, the *Aſſemblies*, nor the *Confeſſion* of any Church require?

Pag. 15. "WE ſhall always, through "God's gracious aſſiſtance, in our future "Miniſtry, to our utmoſt avoid *all appearances of oppoſition* to one another, ſo "as not to hinder or prejudice, but as far "as in us lies, to promote the ſucceſs "thereof, and the common benefit thereby."

WHEN the following behaviour of ſome of our *diſſenting Brethren* is obſerved in many ſignal inſtances, it might be well ſuſpected, whether ever they ſubſcribed an engagement ſo ſolemn; or if they did, what

what can be contrived to oblige them? But that they did ſubſcribe, ſee *pag.* 16. SECT. I.

" *December* 16. 1692. This day the " Brethren, who endeavoured to accom- " modate this Controverſy, did with Mr. " *Williams*, and Mr. *Chauncy*, and thoſe " other five, who with him objected a- " gainſt Mr. *Williams*'s Book, ſubſcribe to " this Agreement, and theſe Doctrinal Pro- " poſitions.

Daniel Williams,
Sam. Anneſley,
John Howe,
Matth. Barker,
Geo. Hammond,
Edw. Veal,
Vincent Alſop,
John James,
Rich. Mayo,
Iſaac Chauncy,
Stephen Lobb,
Sam. Slater,
Geo. Griffith,
Tho. Cole,
Nath. Mather,
Rob. Trayl,
Rich. Taylor.

" ON *December* 19. This expedient was " brought to a meeting of the *united Mi-* " *niſters*, who unanimouſly expreſſed their " approbation in the following words, *viz.* " That thoſe Brethren, who, at the deſire " of the *united Miniſters*, conſidered ſome " Objections againſt Mr. *Williams*'s Book, " having brought in the abovementioned " expedient for Accommodation of the " matters in controverſy; the *united Mi-* " *niſters* have weighed it, and approve of " the ſame. Beſides, it was further de-

SECT. I. "clared by them, That whereas the *united Ministers* collectively considered, and "as such, have not been desired to approve of Mr. *Williams*'s Book; in like "manner, they do not by any thing in "this Agreement, imply an approbation "of Mr. *Chauncy*'s Writings in this controversy: Nevertheless they do rejoice, "that both Mr. *Williams*, and Mr. *Chauncy*, have accepted this offered expedient."

WE hoped after this Agreement, union and peace were well secured: But (alas!) in a little time (without any occasion given on our parts,) we found; besides the endeavours of those, who came not into the *Union*, to prejudice people against us and our Doctrine, as well as against the Union; that several of those called *Congregational*, who were members of the Union, frequented not our meeting, but oft joined with the former in a meeting at *Pinners-Hall*, the very day and hour of the week, in which our meetings of Ministers are statedly kept: Yea, and some of them in print reflected on our meetings in very unbeseeming terms, as will be made appear if occasion require. Nevertheless, our zeal for Peace, did not only prevail with us to be silent under these publick affronts, but set us on making a new essay for a *Reunion*, about the latter end of the Year 1694. To which end, we appointed a number

number to meet, both with the *diſſenting Brethren* who had left us, and with ſuch who had always refuſed to be of us. Theſe *diſſenting Brethren* pretended nothing for their ſeparation, but that there were erroneous perſons in the Union. To gratify them as to this, the perſons deputed by us admitted ſuch proviſion as pleaſed thoſe Brethren, againſt whatever Errors they ſuſpected any of our number guilty of. This you will find in the former part of the *following Paper*, which was brought to our meeting, as what would ſatisfy the *Diſſenters*, if aſſented to by us. Some of us were ſenſible of this new Impoſition of theirs, (againſt whoſe Opinions we had ſo much to object,) and of the dangerous conſequences of thus multiplying *Confeſſions*, as alſo of favouring ſuch unjuſt ſuſpicions of our Principles, which we knew they had no reaſon for, as to any of our number. Nevertheleſs, we ſubmitted in proſpect of a Coalition; only finding *their Paper* to want due proviſion againſt *Criſpian* and *Antinomian* Errors, which many did publickly eſpouſe and abet, we deſired Mr. *Howe*, Mr. *Stretton*, Mr. *Williams*, and Mr. *Lobb*, to ſupply the ſaid defect. The reſult whereof you have in the *enſuing Paper*, which was unanimouſly agreed to in our meeting, and ſent from us by Mr. *Lobb* to our *diſſenting Brethren*, on *Jan.* 7. 1694. SECT. I.

SECT. I.

AFTER a Preface it thus follows,

"WE the *united Ministers* in and about "*London*, considering of a way whereby "to preserve the *Union*, and prevent any "mistakes and remove any prejudices, "that may arise amongst us to interrupt "the foresaid *Union*, do declare, That we "still adhere to the Terms thereof, and "do still submit to the holy Scriptures as "the Rule of Faith and Practice, and do "own the doctrinal part of those com-"monly called the *Articles* of the *Church* "*of England*, or the *Confession*, shorter "and larger *Catechisms*, compiled by the "*Assembly* at *Westminster*, or the *Savoy* "Confession; and do renounce, and tes-"tify against, all Opinions and Doctrines "dissonant therefrom: As for instance, "among many others,

"[1.] THAT there is no definite "number of Persons elected from all eter-"nity, whom God will by his appointed "means certainly save, and bring to eternal "Life; leaving the rest, who fall under "a just Condemnation for their original "and actual Sins, especially for their "neglect and contempt of the Means of "Salvation.

"[2.] THAT Christ died equally for "all Men, not intending the final Salvation "of some more than others.

"[3.] THAT

" [3.] THAT Men have it in their own Power, by the uſe of the natural faculties of their Reaſon and Will, unaſſiſted by the ſpecial Light and Grace of the Holy Ghoſt, to perform all that is neceſſary to Salvation; or that his ſpecial efficacious Light and Grace is not neceſſary to their converſion, perſeverance, and final ſalvation. SECT. I.

" [4.] THAT any of them whom God hath foreknown, predeſtinated, and called effectually according to the purpoſe of his Grace, ſhall fall away, either totally, or ſo as not to be finally glorified.

" [5.] THAT Faith, Repentance, a holy Converſation, or any Act or Work whatever done by us, or wrought by the Spirit of God in us, are any part of that Righteouſneſs, for the ſake of which, or on the account whereof, God doth juſtify any man, or entitle him to eternal Life.

" On the other ſide,

" (1.) THAT Men are under no obligation to make uſe of their natural Faculties, with ſuch external Means of ſalvation as God affords them; praying in hope, for his gracious aſſiſtance, in order to that bleſſed end.

" (2.) THAT God hath not made Offers of Grace by Chriſt, to all within the ſound of the Goſpel; teſtifying that

" whoever

SECT. I.

" whoever believeth shall be saved, without excluding any, and commanding them to believe accordingly.

" (3.) THAT any are in the sight of God justified, or entitled to eternal Life, before they are effectually called, or while they remain unregenerate, or in unbelief.

" (4.) THAT any may expect Pardon without Repentance.

" (5.) THAT continued Repentance towards God, and Faith in our Lord Jesus, and Holiness of heart and life, are not in the nature of the thing, and by the constitution of the Gospel, necessary to Salvation.

" (6.) THAT the Moral Law is not of use to unregenerate men, to awaken their Consciences to fly from the Wrath to come, and drive them to Christ; or that it is not a rule of Life to them that live under the Gospel, as well as others.

" (7.) THAT Believers falling into grievous Sins, do not incur God's displeasure thereby; or that they may expect Assurance otherwise, than by the evidence of those Graces to which the promises of Salvation are made, and by the Testimony of the Spirit of Adoption witnessing with our Spirits, that we are the Children of God.

" WE have thought it our Duty to bear our Testimony against all these errone-

" ous

" ous Opinions, or any other contrary to SECT.
" the plain tenour of the Goſpel of God. I.
" And we do further proteſt againſt any
" deſign of undermining one another in
" any matter of Church-Government, but
" do heartily deſire to maintain Commu-
" nion with each other, according to the
" *Heads of Agreement* we have aſſented
" to. And if any thing hath been done
" or ſpoken by any of us, through miſtake
" or inadvertency, that may cauſe any juſt
" offence to the prejudice of the ſaid *Uni-*
" *on*, we are ready upon better informa-
" tion to rectify the ſame; ſtill deſiring,
" and mutually reſolving, a Brotherly For-
" bearance towards one another, in any
" leſſer points wherein we may differ."

OUR concern for *Union* will appear, if it be conſidered, that (to the beſt of our knowledge) we retained all the very words ſent by them to us, as a guard againſt each of the Errors of which they ſuſpected any of us: The proviſion we added, is generally in the words of the *Aſſembly*, to which we hoped they would be more eaſily induced to aſſent, than if we had expreſſed ourſelves in other words; and we limited our additions to ſuch Errors, as are the other extream to the Articles they had choſen to inſiſt upon, whereas we might have provided againſt each of Dr. *Criſp*'s Errors.

SECT. I.

A GOOD iſſue of this Paper was expected by many of us: But to our grief it was rejected, and no Anſwer ſent us concerning it to this very day. Yea, a Coalition hereupon was chearfully hoped for by us, even after their Friends had (*Nov.* 7. 1694.) neceſſitated Four of our number to leave the Lecture at *Pinners-Hall*, and all ſuch of the *diſſenting Brethren*, who were managers of the relief for poor Miniſters, had deſerted their Aſſociates; with other things, not ſo directly belonging to the Body of *united Miniſters* as ſuch. But alas! (as they had generally abſented from us long before,) all the Brethren called *Congregational* (except the reverend and upright Mr. *Barker*, and a very few more,) joined as a ſeparate Party from us, in the *Monday*'s meeting at *Pinners-Hall*, with the Miniſters who had oppoſed the *Union* ever ſince it was concluded.

THE temper of our Brethren's Spirits, the methods taken to expoſe us, their diſappointing us ſo often, when we thought they had been obliged, and the unſucceſsfulneſs of ſo many probable attempts for Re-union, might well diſcourage any further endeavours: Yet when we heard that any of theſe Brethren had the leaſt diſpoſition towards Peace, we applied ourſelves to an Accommodation. In order thereunto, the Reverend Dr. *Bates*, Mr. *Hammond*, Mr. *Hill*, and Mr. *Slater*, in con-

concurrence with Mr. *Howe*, and Mr. *Williams*, were desired to draw up a proposal, which they brought to our meeting, as that wherein they were all agreed; and after we had several days considered the same, it was unanimously assented to, and sent by us in a Letter to our Brethren. SECT. I.

The Paper, by the Report *called* the Third Paper, *which was sent by the* united Brethren *to such as had left the Union.*

"WHEREAS some unhappy Differences have arisen among us, "principally about the Doctrine of Justification, as set forth in Mr. *Williams*'s "Book, entitled, *Gospel-Truth stated*, to "which several of our Names are prefixed, we being willing to give all reasonable satisfaction therein, for the removing the present, and preventing all "future Differences, which will otherwise "tend to the dishonour of God, disquiet "of his Churches, and danger of Souls; "do hereby declare our Judgment concerning the same.

"THAT we adhere to our former Approbation of the Doctrinal *Articles* of "the *Church of England*, or the *Confession of Faith* compiled by the *Assembly* at "*Westminster*, or that at the *Savoy*, as "agreeable to the Word of God; and "particularly, to the *Articles* collected by

"us

SECT. I.

" us out of the *Confession* with the *Cate-*
" *chisms* compiled by the same *Assembly*,
" printed 1693. And further we declare,
" That if any shall express himself disa-
" greeably thereto, in any momentous
" Points of Doctrine, we will with bro-
" therly candour and kindness endeavour
" to give, and receive, just satisfaction
" therein; bearing with one another's In-
" firmities, and different Sentiments in
" matters of lesser weight; not contend-
" ing about *Logical*, or *Philosophical* Terms,
" or mere *human Forms of Speech*; nor
" judging it reasonable or just, to charge
" upon any such consequences of any ex-
" pression or opinion of his, which he
" himself shall disown.

" AND we further declare, as to the
" special matters in difference,

" I. Concerning *Justification*. That altho'
" the express Word of God do assert the
" necessity of *Regeneration*, to our entring
" into the Kingdom of God; and re-
" quires *Repentance*, that our Sins may be
" blotted out; and *Faith in Christ*, that
" we may be justified; and *Holiness* of
" heart and life, without which we can-
" not see God: Yet that *none of these*,
" or any Work done by Men, or wrought
" by the Spirit of God in them, is, un-
" der any denomination whatsoever *, *any*
part

* Note, *It was declared, that by the words,* [under]

" *part of the Righteouſneſs*, for the ſake, SECT.
" or on the account whereof, God doth I.
" pardon, juſtify, or accept Sinners, or
" entitle them to eternal Life; that being
" only *the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt* without
" them, imputed to them, and received
" by Faith alone.

" II. OF a *Commutation of Perſons* be-
" tween Chriſt and us. As we are to
" conſider our Lord Jeſus Chriſt in his
" obedience and ſufferings, as God and
" Man inveſted with the office of Media-
" tor; ſo it is apparent, this *Commuta-*
" *tion of Perſons* with us was not *natural*,
" in reſpect of either nature, by which
" his individual Subſtance ſhould become
" ours, and ours his; nor *moral*, in re-
" ſpect of qualities or actions, whereby he
" ſhould become inherently ſinful, and we
" immediately ſinleſs; nor was it any
" change, whereby his office of Mediator
" ſhould be transferred on us: But it is to
" be underſtood in a *legal*, or *judicial*
" Senſe, (as we may call it,) *viz.* He by
" agreement between the Father and him,
" *came into our room and ſtead*, not to re-
" pent and believe for us, which the Goſ-
" pel

der any denomination whatſoever,] *we exclude* all Righteouſneſs *from being* meritorious, *or* atoning, *yea, or a procuring cauſe of theſe benefits; none is at all ſo, but the* Righteouſneſs of Chriſt: *But we intended not to exclude, what the Goſpel requireth in order to our Intereſt in thoſe benefits, given for the ſake of* Chriſt's Righteouſneſs.

SECT. I.

" pel requires of us as our Duty, (though " he hath undertaken the Elect ſhall in " due time be enabled thereto;) but to " anſwer for our violation of the Law of " works: *He being made ſin for us, who* " *knew no ſin, that we might be made the* " *righteouſneſs of God in him.* 2 Cor. " v. 21.

" III. OF God's being *pleaſed* or *diſpleaſed* " with Chriſt, as ſtanding, and ſuffering " in our ſtead. We judge, that God " was *always pleaſed* with Chriſt, both " in his Perſon, and in the execution of " all his Offices, (which is expreſſed moſt " particularly in that of his Prieſtly, " *John* x. 17, 18. *Therefore doth my Fa-* " *ther love me, becauſe I lay down my life,* " &c.) and was no otherwiſe *diſpleaſed*, " than as having a diſpaſſionate Will to " inflict upon him the puniſhment of our " Sins, which he had undertaken to bear, " that God might, without Injury to his " Juſtice or Honour, pardon and ſave pe- " nitent Believers, for his Satisfaction, and " Interceſſion founded thereon.

" Mr. *Williams* freely declareth his con- " currence with us in theſe Three particu- " lars, and that his Judgment was never " contrary to the ſenſe of this Paper, for " which he appeals to the ſaid Book: So " it is manifeſt, that when he uſeth the " phraſe of *no change of Perſon* between " Chriſt and the Elect, it could not be in-

" tended

" tended as a denial of a Change of Per- SECT.
" ſons between Chriſt and us in the ge- I.
" neral ſenſe, but only in oppoſition to
" the opinion of his adverſary he wrote
" againſt; for in that very place he ex-
" preſsly affirms, *That Chriſt ſuffered and*
" *died, in our room and ſtead.*

" AND we do declare, that whoſoever
" ſhall be found to expreſs themſelves in
" their preaching or writing, agreeably to
" *this Paper*, and to the mentioned *Ar-*
" *ticles* or *Confeſſions*, we ſhall eſteem
" them to deliver the ſincere Goſpel of
" our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt; and
" it ſhall be remote from us to oppoſe or
" reflect upon, but we ſhall to our utmoſt
" encourage, and give countenance to,
" one anothers Miniſtry therein.

" SUCH of us, whoſe Names are pre-
" fixed to the ſaid Book, do declare, they
" were given to the ſtate of *Truths* and
" *Errors*, as formerly expreſſed in the
" Paper, entituled, *The Agreement in Doc-*
" *trine*, ſubſcribed and publiſhed, *Anno*
" *Dom.* 1692."

THEY who framed this Propoſal, had before them two Papers; one which the *Report* calls *the Firſt Paper*, which one of our Brethren had, with great condeſcenſion and inclination to Peace, concerted with ſome of the *Diſſenters*: Which Paper, although it was never propoſed to, nor

SECT. I. read in any of our publick meetings of Ministers, and was unanimously agreed to be laid aside with a *Second Paper*, that had been brought unto us by another Brother; yet it is manifest, the Brethren in the framing of this *Third* (which is *our only Paper*,) greatly accommodated themselves to the model of the *First*. For they admit a new Debate concerning Mr. *Williams*'s Book, after a solemn accommodation of that whole matter, when the *Dissenters* had unjustly made it an occasion of difference so many years before. They also recite two passages of Mr. *Williams*, as excepted against by the *Dissenters*, and limit the declaration of our Judgment to the *Three Heads*, the Objectors did chuse to insist upon; whereas you will presently read a *Vote* of us *united Ministers*, wherein we require a disowning of very many *Antinomian Errors*, published by several of these *Dissenters*, whenever they shall make the disowning of any passages out of Books written against *Antinomianism*, a Term of Union. Yea further, we retain the whole provision of the *First Paper*, against any of our surmised Errors in the Doctrine of *Justification*, and what we add is in Scripture words. And in the other Two Heads, we come as near as we can with truth, and freedom from ambiguity, in Points of so great concernment, and in a time when so many are at work to propagate *Crispianism*,

niſm, and *Antinomianiſm*. A Coalition could be no indifferent thing to ſuch, who to obtain it do thus condeſcend, and deny themſelves. SECT. I.

BUT to give our attempt a yet greater advantage, we omitted not to addreſs ourſelves to our Brethren, with the moſt affectionate, fervent, and humble intreaties and ſupplications, as well as perſuaſive Arguments; as you will ſee in this *Letter* which we ſent to them, with the foremention'd Paper.

To our reverend, and duely reſpected, and beloved Brethren *in our common Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, Mr.* Griffith, *Mr.* Mead, *Mr.* Chauncy, *Mr.* James, *Mr.* Lobb, *and the reſt of the Brethren of the Union, who for ſome time have forborn to meet with the* united Miniſters *at Dr.* Anneſley's *meeting place.*

"Reverend Brethren,

"YOUR forbearing to meet with us "at our ordinary times and places "for ſo many months, hath made a deep "and ſmarting impreſſion on our Spirits, "and filled our hearts with Grief and "Wonder: With Grief, becauſe we have "been ſo long deprived of much of that "ſatisfaction and aſſiſtance, which your "preſence with us was wont to afford us: "With Wonder, becauſe we could nei-

SECT. I.

" ther apprehend, nor receive any certain " Information of, thoſe Reaſons, which " prevailed with you to keep off ſo long " from our Conventions. For to this day " you never acquainted us, directly, and " clearly, of any Offence that was ever " offered to you, by the *united Miniſters*, " as ſtanding in that Capacity. Had you " been pleaſed to ſignify your Reſentments " to them, they take themſelves to have " been obliged to have ſought out proper " ways and means, for the removal of all " prejudices, and of rendering to you rea- " ſonable and due ſatisfaction.

" ALL the light that we have received " about matters in difference between us, " hath been from a reverend Brother, " who told us, That by Conference with " ſome who forbear to come to our meet- " ings, he underſtood, that they appre- " hended, there are thoſe in our *Union*, " who have ſentiments about the Doctrine " of *Juſtification*, different from the com- " mon Faith of all Orthodox Proteſtants, " and ſo, diſſonant from the holy Scrip- " tures, and the Confeſſions, which have " been owned and approved by us. The " ſame Brother added, that if there were " ſufficient evidence and aſſurance given " them, that the Body of the *united Mi-* " *niſters* would approve themſelves ſound, " clear, and ſtedfaſt in that moſt weighty " and important Doctrine, (which we all

" acknow-

" acknowledge to be *Articulus ſtantis vel* SECT.
" *cadentis Eccleſiæ,)* they would then I.
" maintain all Brotherly communion with
" us.

" WHEN this was notified to us, we
" preſently conceived great and good hopes,
" that all Jealouſies might be eaſily re-
" moved, and that a Redintegration of
" Affections would immediately follow.
" And what ſhould hinder? For if you do
" attentively and deliberately weigh what
" is aſſerted in the Article of *Juſtification*
" in the incloſed Paper, (which was una-
" nimouſly agreed unto, after open read-
" ing, and that upon ſeveral days,) we are
" confident, that it will evidently and un-
" deniably appear, that we perfectly agree
" with our Brethren in the evangelical
" Doctrine of *Juſtification*, even in the
" very phraſes and modes of Expreſſion.

" OUR Agreement in the Doctrine of
" *Juſtification*, which was as the Teſt and
" Cement of our *Union*, being ſo happily
" eſtabliſhed and fixed; we ſhall need to
" ſay but little, touching the other two
" points mentioned in the incloſed Paper;
" which (as we think) are ſo clearly and
" candidly ſtated, that we believe, (as we
" ſuppoſe, upon ſure and certain grounds,)
" there will be nothing remaining (upon
" that account,) to obſtruct our entire and
" hearty *Union*.

" IT would be ſuperfluous to lay before

SECT. I.

" you any conſiderations, to ſet forth the " deſirableneſs, uſefulneſs, and (we may " add) the neceſſity of Miniſterial con- " cord; or to repreſent the ſin and miſ- " chief, that will inſeparably cleave to our " unbrotherly breaches. We all find (by " ſad experience,) what advantage is given " thereby, to ſome who ſeek occaſion to " reproach us, and to hinder the ſucceſs " or acceptableneſs of our Miniſtry. They " do certainly wiſh, and will endeavour " to make, our wound incurable. But we " truſt, the Lord will blaſt their deſigns, " and fruſtrate their expectations, by en- " lightning our minds, to receive and hold " faſt all Truths, and eſpecially thoſe which " are *fundamental*; and will, by his Grace, " moſt ſweetly and effectually draw our " hearts to *love as brethren*, that we may " cloſely, ſtrongly, and intimately knit toge- " ther in inviolable bonds; and ſo guide us, " that we may all *follow after the things* " *that make for Peace, and the things where-* " *with one may edify another.*

" AND now (dear Brethren,) we do, " with all ſincerity and ardor, beſeech you " to meet us with the like frame of Spirit; " that our only emulation and contention " may be, who ſhall be moſt induſtrious " to promote the intereſt of our Lord Re- " deemer; be moſt uſeful to the Souls we " are ſet to watch over; and be moſt for- " ward to embrace each other in the arms " of Love.

" THAT

" THAT theſe bleſſed Ends may be the more effectually purſued, we do (with all importunity and fervor) beſeech you, to return to and frequent our meetings, as ye have formerly done: That we may join with you there in your holy Prayers, be aſſiſted with your wholeſome Counſels, and be refreſhed with your much deſired Society; that we may *with one mind, and one mouth, glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* Amen. SECT. I.

" IF, after the peruſal of the incloſed Paper, ye meet with any thing therein, that may ſeem to need further explanation; and ye be willing to entertain a Conference about it: Be pleaſed to appoint the time and place, when, and where, a determinate number of the *united Miniſters* may meet with a like number of the Brethren nominated by you, and we ſhall moſt readily and chearfully comply with your Propoſal. Howbeit, we muſt add, That we hope, we have already ſet down our ſentiments, as nakedly and perſpicuouſly as we could expreſs them, in purſuance of our End, which was to give you all poſſible ſatisfaction.

" WE conclude this Paper with two earneſt requeſts to you: (1.) Upon the hopes which you have conceived, that (thro' the grace and bleſſing of our God)

SECT. I.

" the differences which have riſen among
" us, will be brought to an happy com-
" poſure; We importunately beſeech you,
" to uſe your uttermoſt endeavours, to
" perſuade thoſe Brethren who have not
" as yet entred into our *Union*, that they
" will join with us in it. And, (2.) That
" you would (as ſoon as conveniently you
" can,) vouchſafe us an Anſwer to this our
" Letter.

" FINALLY, Brethren, *Farewell*; *be*
" *perfect*, *be of good comfort*, *be of one*
" *mind*, *live in peace*; *and the God of love*
" *and peace ſhall be with you.* Signed at
" Dr. *Anneſley's*, October 27. 1696. by
" *George Hammond*, Moderator."

To our *Letter* ſo ſubmiſſive, peaceable, and importunate, we received *this* and no other *Anſwer*.

" Reverend Brethren,

" HAVING received from you a
" Letter with a Paper incloſed, in
" Anſwer thereunto ſuffer us to acquaint
" you, That a Paper was ſubſcribed by a
" conſiderable number of you, and ap-
" proved of by us ſome months ſince,
" which we have reaſon to believe ſome
" of you have had the peruſal of: We
" therefore to whom your Letter is di-
" rected, do not reckon it *brotherly* in us,
" to forſake them who have ſubſcribed the

" fore-

" foreſaid Paper; but do rather judge our- SECT.
" ſelves bound in conſcience, to intreat I.
" your hearty Concurrence with them,
" and us, in that *Firſt Paper*; which, as
" we have already ſaid, hath been ſub-
" ſcribed by very principal and reverend
" Miniſters, highly eſteemed both by you
" and us: And this we hope, may, thro'
" the Bleſſing of God, be the ſpeedieſt
" way to obtain the deſirable End. *Sub-*
" *ſcribed in the name of ſeveral of the Bre-*
" *thren, to whom your Letter was commu-*
" *nicated.*"

THIS is the Letter our *Reporter* complains we gave no reply to; wherein we think we paid a great regard to them who ſent it: And we ſhall ſtill overlook it, otherwiſe than to note, *Firſt*, It is more than probable, *ſome of us* peruſed, what *a conſiderable number of us* ſubſcribed. *Secondly*, Our Brethren who ſubſcribed, could not judge it *unbrotherly*, to be forſaken in laying aſide the *Firſt Paper*, when every one of them had laid it aſide before, and joined in the *Third Paper*, and in the *Letter* whereto this Anſwer is given; (which it's ſtrange any of the *Diſſenters* could be ignorant of.) *Thirdly*, What is *the deſirable End?* Had they ſaid *Union*, it would have been more acceptable to us, than it ſeemed to be to ſuch of themſelves, who declared in one of the meetings about this expedi-

ent,

SECT. I.

ent, " That it was not intended by this at-
" tempted Agreement, that they would
" join with us in our meetings as *united*
" *Miniſters*, but that an agreement in
" Doctrine might be a ſtep to further
" Union:" Yea, we can ſcarce hope, they would have re-united, could we have ſubmitted to their Paper, becauſe, as we are informed, Mr. *Cole* and Mr. *Mather* refuſed their aſſent to it. And this their Letter was ſubſcribed in the name, but of *ſeveral*, (not of *all*,) to whom it was communicated; nor (as we find,) was any *Union* or Agreement, engaged or expreſſed, except in Doctrine, had this expedient obtained.

THIS is the true State of the caſe between our Brethren and us. Could we have obtained a *Re-union*, upon mutual forbearance wherein we differ: Had any of theſe Accounts of our Principles ſatisfied them; (tho' we therein admit ſo rigid and full a tryal wherein they ſuſpected us, and propoſe ſo very ſhort and eaſy a Teſt, when we affirm the Truths denied by them:) Had our importunity for Peace, attended with much patience and condeſcenſion, been accepted; the miſchievous effects of our Differences had been prevented. Nor can we gueſs, what would prevail with the Authors of theſe Diviſions, unleſs that a Book ſhould be diſowned, which, the Subſcribers are convinced, is of great uſe for the

the Defence of the Goſpel in a time abounding with Errors; and ſuch Truths betrayed, as the uſefulneſs of our Miniſtry and practical Religion depend upon: Things we are ſure Chriſt would not approve, nor could we expect *a Peace ſo bought* to prove a Bleſſing. SECT. I.

WE were well aſſured, that a faithful Account of the State of things among us, muſt acquit us of the blame of thoſe unhappy Differences, and prevent the advantages ſome made by miſ-repreſenting us: Nevertheleſs, we had ſtill remained ſilent, if this ſo unjuſt a *Report* (with a paper of *Remarks* following it,) had not been obtruded on the World, and with art ſcattered throughout the Kingdom, yea, ſent to foreign Nations, as can be proved. After this indeed, our ſilence would proclaim us ſtupidly inſenſible, and unconcerned for the common Good, as well as for our own reputation and uſefulneſs.

WE ſhall proceed to conſider what is material in the *Report*.

Firſt, THE *Report* ſaith, *Our differences may be reduced to Chriſt's Satisfaction, and the Penal Sanction of the Law; tho' hitherto, the greateſt ſtruggle hath been about the firſt.*

Anſw. 1. THE firſt was no part of the difference, till of late, that Mr. *Lobb* contrived to make it ſo, tho' without any Reaſon;

SECT. I. Reaſon; for Mr. *Williams* rightly and fully aſſerted the firſt in his Books. And the utmoſt that can be made of the latter is, that Mr. *Williams* aſſerts, that if the Precepts of the Law of works be conſidered as taken into the Goſpel, they fall under the Goſpel-Sanction; and tho' in this reſpect there is a change of the Sanction, yet the Precepts being conſidered ſtill as a part of the Law of works, they are under the *ſame Legal Sanction as at firſt*; which is to ſay, The Covenant of works and the Goſpel-Covenant differ. And yet this ſeems to be reſerved for a new Controverſy, if we had agreed to their very mode of expreſſing the point he inſiſteth on.

Anſw. 2. IT is a very great miſtake, that our difference with them is reduced to theſe two points: Alas! It extends to many other things, *viz. moſt of Dr.* Criſp's *Opinions*, as to which they refuſe to give us ſatisfaction; tho' he granteth, theſe two are all they quarrel with us about, and how unjuſtly will preſently be ſeen. We ſhall detect his miſtake by a brief Narrative.

(1.) THE difference originally appeareth to be about moſt of thoſe Poſitions, called *Truths* and *Errors* in the State of them in Mr. *William*'s Book: For Six of the *Diſſenters* did not only object ſome particular paſſages, but they deny thoſe to be *Truths* which are called *Truths*, and ſuch to be *Errors* which are called *Errors*, in

in the ii, v, vii, viii, xii, xvi, xviii, and xix Chapters of that Book: Yea, they ſay, "They find not *Truth* and *Error* "rightly ſtated *in other places* beſides "theſe:" Thus they ſay, in Mr. *Chauncy's Neonomianiſm unmaſked*, par. iii. *pag.* 96. whereas many of our Brethren ſubſcribed, that each of theſe were *rightly ſtated.* He that will read the *Truths* and *Errors* in thoſe ſeveral Chapters, may judge of the difference, and whether any of Dr. *Criſp's* Errors will be diſowned. SECT. I.

(2.) IN the forecited Articles of 1694. you will find, that when we had owned ſuch to be Errors, which they required of us, yet they refuſed to diſown thoſe Errors which we added; and therefore the difference at that time, reſpected whatever they refuſed to agree with us in, and was not ever ſince accommodated.

(3.) THE *Reporter* cannot be ignorant, that *September* 15. 1695. this Vote unanimouſly paſſed among the *united Brethren*, "Upon reading a Paper relating to ſeve-"ral dangerous Expreſſions in favour of "*Antinomianiſm*, it is agreed, If any thing "objected out of Books written againſt *An-"tinomianiſm* be required to be diſowned "as a Term of Union, that thoſe things "read this day, and further to be collected "of that kind out of the Books *on the other "ſide*, ſhall be required to be diſowned."

Some

SECT. I. *Some things collected out of the Books of Mr.* Chauncy, *Mr.* Cole, *Mr.* Mather, *and Mr.* Trayl.

" TO talk of a Goſpel threat, is a *Ca-*
" *tachreſis* at beſt, and nothing elſe
" can ſave it from being a *Bull.*—Pardon
" is rather the Condition of Faith, (and
" much more, having a cauſal influence
" thereunto,) than Faith and Repentance
" are of Pardon.—It was Sin, as to the
" ανομια, that Chriſt bore; the fault of ſin
" was laid upon Chriſt, the ſin itſelf as op-
" poſed to guilt: Chriſt was reputed a
" Criminal, not only by Man, but by
" God.—As to the Elect, there was ne-
" ver any Guilt upon them, in reſpect of
" the righteous Judgment of God, *in foro*
" *Dei*; but that which accompanied the
" letter of the Law, ſetting in with the
" Conſcience.---Juſtification is before ef-
" fectual Vocation: The Doctrine of Juſ-
" tification before Faith, is not an Error,
" but a great and glorious Truth. Juſti-
" fication in regard of Application, muſt
" be before believing: The firſt Applica-
" tion, *ordine naturæ ſaltem*, is to an un-
" godly man, *eo nomine*, that he may be-
" lieve: We believe, that we may be juſ-
" tified declaratively.

" IT is denied, that God requires Faith
" as an indiſpenſable Qualification, in

" thoſe

" thoſe whom he will juſtify for Chriſt's SECT.
" merits.—Unbelief is not the Cauſe, why I.
" men are barred from Juſtification, and
" obnoxious to Miſery.—You talk of an
" offer to the Non-elect, and that offer
" you ſay muſt be ſerious, *&c.* But I
" pray, where is any offer of Grace to
" the Non-elect at all, as ſuch? And
" ſhew me any Grace given, or Goſpel
" Duties required of the Non-elect, or Be-
" nefits promiſed to the Non-elect, upon
" their performance of Grace and Du-
" ties, *&c.*---And what if the Non-elect
" be in as bad a caſe as the Devils, Is
" God bound to be any better to them
" than to the Devils? God hath not ſaid,
" I will ſave a Non-elect Perſon if he
" believe; more than he hath ſaid, A
" Horſe ſhall be a Man, if he can uſe
" reaſon, or ſpeak; or a Man ſhall be a
" Horſe, if he hath four feet.

" GOD was reconciled to the Elect at
" Chriſt's death, but we are reconciled to
" God by the Goſpel-miniſtry.---Union
" with Chriſt is before Faith, at leaſt *na-*
" *turâ*, and we partake of the Spirit by
" virtue of that Union: There is a com-
" pleat Union with Chriſt, before the
" act of Faith.---All that a Believer can
" pray for, is the further manifeſtation
" of Pardon; for he knows that all his
" ſins are pardoned.--- A Believer is to
" work from Life, and not for Life.---

" It

SECT. I. " It is a great Truth, that God ſees no ſin " in a Believer: Sin can do no real hurt " to a Believer. God is not diſpleaſed " with his people, and is not angry with " the perſons of Believers, for their ſins. " ---Legal Convictions before ſaving Faith " are no more than ſin; it is but the fil- " thy, Conſcience-polluting, Guilt of ſin.-- " There is no preparatory work, diſtinct " from God's act in effectual Calling.

" THE Goſpel is no Rule of Judgment; " that's the Law only: The Goſpel is not " any part of the Rule of Judgment at " the laſt day; that's only the Law of " Creation. --- It is denied, that at the " Judgment Day there will be a Trial, " upon which ſome will be juſtified, others " condemned. — Chriſt's precepts are not " Laws with a Sanction.—Sanctification " is not the way of a juſtified Perſon to " Heaven.—If you look upon Graces and " Duties, and Salvation, as two diſtinct " things, I deny, that they are neceſſary " to give a right to Salvation. All imper- " fect Holineſs is Sin.—*Turn ye, turn ye, " why will ye die?* is but the triumph of " the Law over a dead Sinner.—An un- " ſaved perſon can do nothing in order to " Salvation.

" GOD was diſpleaſed with Chriſt as " our Surety.—We in Chriſt ſatisfied the " Juſtice of God.—We through Chriſt's " Righteouſneſs have a right to Glory, by

" *Adam's*

" *Adam*'s Covenant.—*Adam* for one good work, ſhould have entered into full poſſeſſion, and a confirmation therein: But to teach that a Chriſtian, upon the actings of Graces, and performance of Duties, may in the virtue of the Promiſe made to the exerciſe of thoſe Graces or Duties, expect any of thoſe promiſed Bleſſings, is to teach a low and ſervile Spirit. SECT. I.

" THE Eternal Life in which the Angels were created and confirmed by Chriſt, differs from that Eternal Life which Believers have in Chriſt; the one is a Creature Life, or a created Life; the other is the Eternal Life of God communicated in time.—Believers are as righteous as Chriſt; I mean, not in a way of Similitude, but in a way of Equality.—Chriſt's Incarnation was no part of his Humiliation.—We coaleſce upon believing into one myſtical Perſon with Chriſt, which is diſtinguiſhed from Legal Union, which is before Faith.—The Goſpel hath no Law-Sanction. It is plainly denied, that the Goſpel is a Law of Grace.—Faith is neither a condition, nor qualification, in the office of Juſtification; —with ſeveral things of the ſame ſort as above recited."

MOST of theſe were then included in the Paper, that the Vote refers to; which,

SECT. I.

with the other things further collected, shall be proved to be in the printed Books of the foresaid Authors, and Book and Page cited for each, when it shall be required: Yea, a great deal more, if not worse, of the same sort.

BY these things it is manifest, what the Difference is about; though a noise hath been raised about things remote from the true occasion, that while we seemed to be only on the defensive part, their Errors might receive countenance as if unopposed, and the Abettors thereof might less appear the cause of our Divisions.

Answ. 3. ALTHOUGH our Brethren from a zeal for Peace condescended to mention but *three particulars* in the *Third Paper*; yet it is too evident, that the *Dissenters* adhere to *their own Paper*, (called *the First,*) and refuse *ours*, because this doth provide some defence against some of the Errors, which our difference is about; (the same cause, for which they rejected the Articles in 1694.) And it is plain by what *their Paper* saith of *Justification*, they had this our Paper of 1694. before them; and therefore must know, that we insisted under that Head to have it clearly expressed, "That none are justified in the sight "of God, or entitled to eternal Life, be- "fore they are effectually called, or whilst "they are unregenerate, or in unbelief:" And, "that men must repent in order to

"for-

" forgiveneſs :" As alſo, " that continued SECT.
" Repentance, Faith, and Holineſs of I.
" heart and life, are by the conſtitution
" of the Goſpel, as well as in the Nature
" of the things themſelves, neceſſary to
" Salvation, *&c.*" Our *diſſenting Brethren* knew this, and yet inſert nothing in that *Firſt Paper* ſufficient to this purpoſe. By the *Reporter*'s way of arguing againſt us, *their not mentioning thoſe things* is their diſowning of them, and owning the contrary: Yea, we have more reaſon to infer thus, becauſe *what they omit* was ſent by the body of *united Miniſters* to them *as a means of Union*; whereas what is omitted by us, was not ſent to us, much leſs to that end, nor adjuſted by our appointment. But we need not to inſiſt on this, when by comparing the *Firſt* and *Third Papers*, it is evident, that the foreſaid Errors are inconſiſtent with the few variations in *our Paper*, but very conſiſtent with *theirs*, though not in the ſenſe deſigned by our ſubſcribing Brethren.

In the firſt part of the Head of Juſtification, *their Paper* ſaith, " Repentance, " Faith, and a holy Converſation, are by " God's expreſs word manifeſtly neceſſary " to *Salvation*." They do not ſay, Repentance is neceſſary to *Pardon*, nor Faith to *Juſtification*, though that be the Head treated of: No, theſe are neceſſary to no more than a holy Converſation is neceſſary

SECT. I. to, that is, to eternal Salvation: Nor do they say, that the necessity of these to Salvation itself is by the Gospel-constitution, or any enacted connection between duty and benefit. Things being thus worded, it may pass with such who tell us, "The "Gospel hath neither precept, threaten- "ing, nor conditional promise: Repent- "ance is not antecedently necessary to Par- "don, nor Faith to the Justification of "our persons, but only to *manifest* to our "consciences for our inward Peace, that "our persons were justified before God "whilst in our unbelief." But such things are prevented by *our Paper*, which saith, "That the Word of God requires Repent- "ance, *that our Sins may be blotted out*, "and Faith *that we may be justified*:" And afterwards, "The Gospel requires of "us as our Duty, that we repent and be- "lieve; and God pardons penitent Believ- "ers." In like manner, *their Paper* in the other Heads expresseth things so, as that such may subscribe it, who think, *the filth and fault of Sin were transacted on Christ*; that *he was the Criminal, the Murtherer*, &c. *in God's account*; that *God was really displeased with Christ, and abhorred him as our Surety*, though not considered in himself; and sundry the like, (that *our Paper* gives no countenance to,) which our subscribing Brethren do abhor.

IT is not then without Reason, that the *Dis-*

Diſſenters inſiſt on the *Firſt Paper*; whether they be ſuch who hold thoſe Errors, or reſolve to indulge ſuch as do ſo. And yet, there wants not Art in placing the difference upon our *omitting a Phraſe* in the *Third Paper*, wherein the true ſenſe of it is expreſſed; for the *Reporter* well ſaw, a quarrel with us for the *omiſſion* of a Phraſe of ſo uncertain a ſenſe, is as yet more plauſible, than their ſtruggle for Errors of ſo ill a ſound would be. SECT. I.

Anſw. 4. BUT if the Doctrines about which we differ are not yet ſufficiently evident, we ſhall with a deſire of Union make this *Propoſal*:

IF our *diſſenting Brethren* will declare their agreement with us,

(1.) THAT *Repentance* towards God is commanded, in order to Remiſſion of Sin.

(2.) THAT *Faith* in Chriſt is commanded by the Goſpel, in order to the Juſtification of our perſons before God, for the ſake of the alone Righteouſneſs of Chriſt.

(3.) THAT the Word of God requires *Perſeverance* in true Faith and Holineſs, that we may be partakers of the heavenly Glory.

(4.) THAT the Goſpel promiſeth Pardon through the blood of Chriſt to the *penitent*, Juſtification before God to the *believer*, and the heavenly Glory to ſuch as *perſevere* in Faith and Holineſs; and alſo

SECT. I. declareth, that God will not pardon the Impenitent, justify the Unbeliever, nor glorify the Apostate or Unholy.

(5.) THAT *justifying Faith* is not only a persuasion of the understanding, but also a receiving and resting upon Christ alone for Salvation.

(6.) THAT by *Change of Person* is meant, that whereas we were condemned for our sins, the Lord Jesus was substituted *in onr room*, to bear the *Punishment* of our sins, for the *Satisfaction* of divine Justice, *that whoever believes on him, may be acquitted and saved*: But it is not intended, that the *Filth of sin* was upon Christ, nor that he was a *Criminal* in God's account.

(7.) THAT by Christ's being our *Surety* is meant, that Jesus Christ, our Mediator obliged himself to expiate our sins by his Blood, and to purchase eternal Life for all that believe, and Faith and every saving Grace for the Elect: But it is not intended, that we were legally reputed to make Satisfaction, or purchase eternal Life.

(8.) THAT by Christ's *answering for us the Obligations of the violated Law of works* is intended, that whereas the Law obliged us to die for our sins, Christ became obliged to *die in our stead*; and whereas we were, after we had sinned, still obliged to yield perfect obedience, Christ perfectly *obeyed the Law*, that upon the account of his

his *active* and *paſſive obedience* believers might be forgiven, and entitled to eternal Life: But it is not intended, that the Senſe of the Law of works ſhould be, that if *we or Chriſt obeyed* we ſhould live, and if *Chriſt ſuffered* we ſhould not die, *though we ſinned:* Nor that Believers are *juſtified*, or to be *judged* by the *Law of works*, but by the Goſpel; although the Righteouſneſs for the ſake of which they are juſtified, be as perfect as that Law of works required, and far more valuable.

SECT. I.

IF our *diſſenting Brethren* will ſubſcribe to theſe Propoſitions and Explications, we will ſubſcribe with them even to the words, *Change of Perſons*, *Surety*, and *anſwering for us the Obligations of the violated Law of works*; as well as we have already ſubſcribed, "That no work done by men, or "wrought by the Spirit of God in them, "is any part of the Righteouſneſs, for "the ſake, or on the account whereof we "are juſtified; that being only the Right-"eouſneſs of Chriſt without us, impu-"ted to us, and received by Faith alone," which is the procuring cauſe of all ſaving Good. How gladly would we re-unite with them, might this but remove the difference!

AND ſince we are content, to uſe their very words and phraſes explained in the Orthodox ſenſe, (the omiſſion whereof is what is excepted againſt us,) we hope,

SECT. I. that such of the *Dissenters* as shall refuse to agree with us, will not hereafter say, that a difference in the Doctrines pretended by the *Report* is the reason why they unite not with us; but will acknowledge, that they keep up the difference from their zeal for the foresaid opinions of Dr. *Crisp* and the *Antinomians*, which we think to be very erroneous.

Secondly, THE *Report* saith, *That the Third Paper was taken and sent from some who meet at* Little St. Helens.

Answ. THESE *some* had with them, *all* of our Brethren who subscribed the *First Paper*, yea, several of them were the Framers of it; as well as *the whole Body* of the *united Ministers* (as far as we know,) consented to it.

Thirdly, THE *Reporter* gives *the Reasons why the* Dissenters *did not approve of the Third Paper*; which are these.

1 *Reason.* HE saith, *pag.* 4. "The *Third* "*Paper* omitted to mention, that *a Change* "*of Persons* is the common Doctrine of *Pro-* "*testants*." And adds, "That neither *Justi-* "*fication*, nor Christ's *Satisfaction*, can be "duly explained, or defended without it; "and that *Grotius*, and the Reverend Bi- "shop of *Worcester*, have proved *a Change* "*of Persons*."

Answ. 1. THE *Third Paper* asserts *a Commutation of Persons*, therefore we wonder, he affirms, *pag.* 5. that we *have not* men-

mentioned it. But having therein fully aſ- SECT. ſerted it in oppoſition to *Sociniamiſm*, is it I. not ſtrange, *our Paper* ſhould be ſcrupled, becauſe we duly explained *Juſtification* and Chriſt's *Satisfaction* thereby, but did not ſay, *They could not be explained without it*, &c? which though we may think, yet the mere ſaying ſo is not the hinge of the Controverſy, nor would it add any ſtrength to the hedge which we have made without it; or elſe ſurely, ſome of our *Proteſtant Confeſſions* would at leaſt have made mention thereof, and therefore theſe Brethren muſt reject every one of thoſe, as well as ours.

Anſw. 2. WE have affirmed and explained *a Change of Perſons*, in the ſame Senſe as *Grotius* and the Reverend Dr. *Stillingfleet* Biſhop of *Worceſter* have done, (as will appear to any who conſult thoſe Authors:) But they are far from approving the *Criſpian* Explication of that Phraſe, as we ſhall evidence by a *Letter* of the ſaid Reverend Biſhop to Mr. *Williams*.

Anſw. 3. As we durſt not imitate the *Reporter*'s liberty, perſuading the world, we denied and rejected *a Commutation* or *Change of Perſons*, when we aſſerted it in expreſs terms; ſo we aſſure him, we deſigned not to offend our Brethren, who, he ſaith, *pag.* 6. *are grieved*, becauſe *our Letter* ſaith, *That on our ſo happy eſtabliſhing the Doctrine of Juſtification, we need*

ſay

SECT. I. *ſay but little in the Point of Commutation of Perſons.* By which words it is plain we meant not, that we ſaid little of it *in our Paper*; where in the ſecond and third Heads we ſaid enough to clear it, even twice more than what we ſaid of Juſtification: But we ſay little of it *in our Letter*, where we have enlarged on Juſtification; becauſe for ſeveral years the *Diſſenters* pretended, all their great Quarrel was about that Doctrine. And may not we juſtly *grieve*, that for our Induſtry in clearing ourſelves beyond all their challenges as to this, we ſhould be *hereticated* by this *Report*, in the new Controverſy ſtarted by Mr. *Lobb*?

2 *Reaſon.* THIS occurs ſo often, that we cannot avoid anſwering it again and again.

3 *Reaſon.* HE ſays, *pag.* 6. "There is "ſuch a *wrong deſcription* given of a *Change* "*of Perſon* in the *Third Paper*, as per-"verts the Doctrine of *Satisfaction*:" Yea, *pag.* 7. he tells us, "Chriſt did not, "yea, *could not make Satisfaction* upon "what you affirm."

Anſw. 1. WE ſhall firſt enquire what deſcription the *Reporter* gives of a *Change of Perſons*, which is ſuch, as muſt with wiſe men juſtify our careful expreſſing our Senſe of this Phraſe. *Pag.* 7. he ſaith, "A *Commutation* is the ſame with a pro-"per *Surrogation*, where the *Surety* puts

"on

" on the *quality, ſtate, and condition* of the *Debtor:*" Pag. 5. he tells us, " We are " all by nature *under the Curſe* of the " Law, and *deſtitute of a Righteouſneſs en-* " *titling to eternal Life;*" and adds, " This " is our ſtate and condition, this is the " place we are in:" And a few lines after he ſaith, " That Chriſt put himſelf *into* " *our place, ſtate, and condition;* ſo that, " whereas *we were Sin and under a Curſe,* " by this bleſſed change *Chriſt was made* " *Sin and a Curſe.*" Here he plainly expreſſeth his ſenſe of the *Change of Perſons.* As to what he ſpeaks of *Chriſt's being a Curſe,* we object not further, than that Chriſt *was not ſo by Nature:* But the things we obſerve are, That he ſaith, *Our ſtate, place, and condition was,* that we were *deſtitute of a Righteouſneſs entitling to eternal Life;* this was our ſtate and place; to which he adds, that *Chriſt put himſelf into* this *our ſtate, place, and condition;* and if ſo, then with him *Chriſt was deſtitute of a Righteouſneſs entitling to eternal Life.* To make this more evident, he ſaith, *we were Sin;* this was our ſtate, place, and condition, into which Chriſt put himſelf; and by this change *was made Sin:* Now, how were we *Sin?* We were *not a Sin-offering,* but ſinful vile offenders; we were *ſinful,* and *deſtitute of all Righteouſneſs;* that was our condition: Yet he ſaith, Chriſt came into *our condition* as we were *Sin;*

SECT. I.

SECT. I.

Sin; which muſt be, that he was changed to be a ſinful vile offender, not an *offering for Sin*, for that was not our Condition. By which it is evident, our Reporter's *Commutation of Perſons* is not, that Chriſt became a Sin-offering, and in our ſtead ſubject to the puniſhments, which by the Law Sinners deſerved, that we might be delivered. No, that will not content him; but that Chriſt was changed to be *a ſinful perſon*, deſtitute of a Righteouſneſs entitling to eternal Life: This is his *Change*, this is his *Chriſt's taking on him the Perſon of Sinners*; which is a poſition, not only unworthy of the praiſes he beſtows on it, *pag.* 5. but ſo horrid, that we hope, ſome of our *diſſenting Brethren* will be provoked to clear themſelves from the Imputation, this *Reporter* ſeems fond to lay them under.

Anſ. 2. THE Arguments muſt be ſtrong, by which he ſaith, *our account of a Change of Perſon is attacked*; if they will prove, that we have thereby *perverted the Doctrine of Satisfaction*, yea, and rendred it *impoſſible*. Whether the *Arguer* and *Reporter* be the ſame Perſon, we enquire not; but that they are of the ſame Spirit none can doubt: In return whereto, we wiſh them more charity and modeſty for the future. However, ſome might expect, they would have conſulted their own Credit ſo far, as not to proclaim the very ſame men, the

moſt

moſt learned and moſt orthodox, and yet *very ignorant and groſsly heretical*; and that, as to the very ſame Point: The *firſt* character the *Reporter* beſtows on them, for ſubſcribing the *Firſt Paper*; yet it abates nothing to them of the *laſt*, ſeeing they will frame and approve of the *Third Paper*. But it greatly concerns all of us, to peruſe the Arguments which follow. SECT. I.

1 *Arg.* "WHEN we diſcourſe of a "*Commutation*, we ſhould conſider Chriſt "(who is inveſted with the Office of Me-"diator,) as *our Surety* in the execution of "his Prieſtly office, *&c.* But wording it "as they do, is calculated for *their Me-"ridian*, who hold Chriſt ſuffered *only in "the Perſon of a Mediator*, not in the "Perſon of Sinners: For which Reaſon "we may perceive, why there muſt not "be the leaſt mention of *Chriſt's Sureti-"ſhip* in the *Third Paper*."

Anſw. 1. CHRIST's *Suretiſhip* did not diveſt him of the office of his Mediatorſhip, but connotes, that as Mediator he engaged himſelf to ſuffer *for condemned Sinners*; yea, and to do much more for them, than what is included in the execution of his Prieſtly office, *viz.* to teach them, to overcome their Enemies, *&c.* Nay more, all Chriſt's Sufferings as a Prieſt, were his Sufferings, as one mediating for Sinners, and not as one become himſelf a Sinner; as he is repreſented to be,

SECT. I. be, by making ſuch a vaſt difference between him as our Mediator, and as Surety.

Anſw. 2. THO' we mention not the word *Surety*, (which we ſcruple not,) yet we did plainly expreſs the thing deſigned by that word; ſo far as belongs to a *ſubſequent Surety* in *criminal* cauſes, (tho' not *pecuniary*,) and as is conſiſtent with Chriſt's being a *Mediator* in all his engagements and performances for us: A diſregard to both which, occaſioneth ſuch confuſed and miſtaken notions concerning theſe Doctrines.

2 *Arg.* "THEIR account of a *Commutation* is; *It's to be underſtood in a* "legal, *or* judicial *Senſe, as we may call it*; "not that it is really ſo, only we may ſo "call it."

Anſw. 1. *As we may call it*, is not oppoſed to *really*, but we uſe it as an Apology for the term *judicial*, as added to *legal*, and as unſcriptural. We mean, that wherein Chriſt ſuffered, he was *judicially* dealt with, as if he had been *the condemned Sinners*, in whoſe room he ſuffered: But knowing that many give a dangerous ſenſe of the word *legal*, when uſed without explication or limitation, we added *judicial* thereto.

Anſw. 2. THE *Reporter* might have ſpared ſaying, *They'll not quarrel about the Term, may the Thing they contend for be granted them.* Inſtead of complaining of a diſ-

a diſreſpect to Fifty or Sixty Miniſters, we'll deſire all our Brethren were as temperate; which would end all Quarrels about *human words*, when *the Senſe* is granted: Nor would this diſparage the *Reporter*, who ſeems ſo fond of *a Set of words*, as if he highly valued himſelf, for his diſcovery of them to his Aſſociates; and therefore he will contend for them *ſo ſtiffly*, that neither union, orthodox explications, nor his reverence for ſome of us, (when uſeful to him,) ſhall ſignify or amount to any thing, if all his Phraſes be not ſtill made uſe of. SECT. I.

3 *Arg.* "WE apprehend this to be their "meaning, becauſe in their Explication, "there is not a word proper and peculiar "to a *Commutation* in a *legal* Senſe, *&c.* "What tho' Chriſt died in the Perſon of "a Mediator, *to anſwer for our violation* "*of the Law of works*, yet if he died not "in the Perſon of Sinners, *to anſwer for* "*them the violated Law of works*, he did "not, he could not, make Satisfaction to "vindictive, or remunerative Juſtice."

Anſw. 1. WE ſhall not inſiſt, how proper Satisfaction is to remunerative Juſtice, nor how unfair it is to argue, as if we had ſaid, Chriſt died *only* in the Perſon of a Mediator, (when *our Paper* hath no ſuch thing;) *only* becauſe himſelf had ſaid, our words are calculated for the *Meridian* of ſuch who hold ſo.

Anſw. 2.

SECT. I.

Anſw. 2. OUR own words will convince the unbiaſſed, whether there be ſtrength or truth in this Argument. Take what we ſay in the ſecond and third Heads in *our Paper*, which muſt be connected to expreſs our Senſe. "Chriſt our "Mediator, by agreement with the Fa- "ther, *came into our room and ſtead*, to an- "ſwer for our violation of the Law of "works; he *being made ſin for us, who* "*knew no ſin, that we might be made the* "*righteouſneſs of God in him*: And with "Chriſt as ſtanding in our ſtead, God "was *no otherwiſe diſpleaſed*, than as hav- "ing a Will to inflict on him the puniſh- "ment of our Sins, which he had under- "taken to bear, that God might, without "injury to his Juſtice or Honour, pardon "and ſave penitent Believers, through his "Satisfaction, and Interceſſion founded "thereon."

CAN any read theſe words, and honeſtly infer, That we have *not a word* proper to a *Commutation* in a *legal* Senſe, or that we *denied Chriſt's Satisfaction*, or that Chriſt's Satisfaction was *impoſſible* by the account we give thereof? And yet we are charged in the *Report* with each of theſe. But for the better information of the Reader, we ſhall ſhew what our account containeth.

(1.) THE Father, as the offended Rector, propoſeth and agrees upon Terms with Chriſt our Mediator, upon which con-

condemned Sinners ſhall be pardoned and ſaved. SECT. I.

(2.) THE Terms propoſed and agreed are ſuch, as ſufficiently ſecure God's Honour, and make amends to Juſtice, ſo that neither are to ſuffer any injury by pardoning the Sinner; and they are ſuch, as *anſwered for all our violations of the Law of works*; and ſuch, as *render Chriſt's Sufferings a puniſhment for our Sins.*

(3.) THE Father and Son agree, not only that theſe Terms are ſufficient, but that alſo they ſhall be accounted to us, and be performed *in our room and ſtead*; (we mean, *vice noſtrâ, & loco noſtro*;) that therein he was to anſwer for our violations of the Law, and that we ſhould be pardoned and ſaved thereupon.

(4.) UPON this agreement, the Father, as a juſt Ruler provoked by us Sinners, doth juſtly inflict the *puniſhment of our ſins* on Chriſt, *for Satisfaction to his Juſtice*, (which is the ſame, as that his Juſtice might not be injured.)

(5.) CHRIST ſuffers thoſe puniſhments *in our ſtead*, and is therein *a Sin-offering for us*, (tho' not deputed by us,) *that we might be made the righteouſneſs of God in him.*

(6.) WHAT he ſuffered is a *Satisfaction*; and his Interceſſion is founded upon that Satisfaction; for and by which the penitent Believer is pardoned and ſaved.

IF we have not herein affirmed and explained

SECT. I. plained *a legal Commutation*, and *Christ's Suretiship* in a sound sense, (tho' not in the *Reporter*'s,) and affirmed *Christ's Satisfaction*, yea, enumerated the essentials of it; we despair that we ever can. And if men will not acknowledge, the *Reporter* doth misrepresent us, and intend his Phrases to be a cover for several Errors, when this orthodox sense of them could not satisfy him; we can but bewail their prejudice and partiality.

Answ. 3. WE do not see, why our words, *viz.* Christ died *in our room and stead* (which he leaves out) *to answer for our violations of the Law of works*, &c. should not make Christ's Satisfaction possible, yea, and affirm it, as well as their words, *viz.* "Christ put on the Person of "Sinners, and came into their room and "stead, to answer for them the obligati-"ons of the violated Law of works." *Putting on the Person of Sinners*, can have no good sense, beyond *Christ's coming into our room and stead*, which we have asserted: The words, [*for them*,] have but the same import: And seeing the violated Law *obliged us to die* for our violations of that Law; if Christ *in our stead answered for our violations of that Law*, for which it put us under those obligations to die; then Christ died *to answer for us the obligations of that violated Law*, that is, its obligations on us to die for our sins; to which Christ's Satis-

Satisfaction (which is the point in hand) refers. SECT. I.

Answ. 4. FROM what we obſerve ſo oft repeated by the *Reporter*, had he juſtly repreſented the *Third Paper*, and dealt ſincerely, he muſt have reduced all his Reaſons and Arguments to prove his heavy Charge againſt us, and to juſtify the *Diſſenters* refuſal of that Paper, to this one Argument, *viz.*

THEY, who in a Paper expreſsly affirm and explain the *Satisfaction of Chriſt*, omitting to mention theſe words, *Chriſt took upon him the Perſon of Sinners*, do pervert, deny, and make the Satisfaction of Chriſt impoſſible: But the *Preſbyterians* (in the *Third Paper*) expreſsly affirm and explain the *Satisfaction of Chriſt*, omitting to mention theſe words, *Chriſt took upon him the Perſon of Sinners*: Therefore the *Preſbyterians* do in the *Third Paper*, pervert, deny, and make the Satisfaction of Chriſt impoſſible.

UPON this Argument, the true weight of the *Reporter*'s cauſe and charge doth hang; and if the *Major* be true, the *Conſequence* will be, that all the Churches of Chriſt in their *Confeſſions* pervert and deny, and make impoſſible the Satisfaction of Chriſt. For to our remembrance, theſe words, *Chriſt took upon him the Perſon of Sinners*, are omitted in the *Confeſſions* of all the Churches; and we had much more reaſon to omit them, when we knew for

SECT. I.

what End they are inſiſted on by ſuch as the *Reporter*.

4 *Arg.* "THEY impoſe a Senſe in expreſs contradiction to the letter and general Scope of Mr. *Williams*'s Book, [that when he ſaith, *There is no Change of Perſons between Chriſt and the Elect*, it could not be intended as a denial of a Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us in the general Senſe, but only in oppoſition to his adverſary he wrote againſt; for in that very place he expreſsly affirms, *Chriſt ſuffered and died in our room and ſtead*;] for his words are as excluſive of *a Change of Perſons* in every Senſe, as words can be. *Goſpel-Truth*, pag. 41, to pag. 46."

Anſw. 1. Mr. *Williams* no where ſaith, *There is not a Change of Perſons* in the Plural number, but *of Perſon* in the Singular; yet the Paper as ſubſcribed made him to ſay the firſt; however the *Report* doth change it now. Nor is this a ſmall miſtake with Mr. *Williams*; when he takes *a Change of Perſons*, to refer thus to intelligent beings, *viz.* Chriſt's dying in the room of condemned Sinners, which he affirms: But *a Change of Perſon* he takes, to denote a Change, as to office, acts, qualities, adjuncts, *&c.* really inſeparable, and peculiar to either Chriſt on the one part, or Men on the other; as is plain by all his Arguments againſt a Change of Perſon, *pag.* 45.

"There

" There is *no Change of Perſon* between Christ and the Elect: For Christ was " the *Saviour*, and never ceaſed to be ſo; " we are the *ſaved*, and not the *ſaviours*: " Christ was the *Redeemer*; we the *re-* " *deemed*, and not the *redeemers*: Christ " was he, who by his *own merits* forgives " us, but never was *forgiven*; we are " *forgiven*, and never had merits of our " own, to forgive ourſelves, or others. " It's profane Arrogance for us to pretend " to his *Prerogatives*; and it's Blaſphemy " to debaſe him among them, who were " Enemies, without ſtrength, and Sinners, " *for whom he was the dying Sacrifice.* It's " enough, that he, reſerving the *peculiars* " of a Redeemer, ſhould agree to *die for* " *our ſins*: It is enough, that we are par- " doned for his ſake, when we deſerved " endleſs woe, and are never capable of " making the leaſt atonement." Here you have all which Mr. *Williams* hath written againſt *a Change of Perſon*, wherein is not a word againſt Change of Perſons; and it's evident, he took *Change of Perſon* in the afore-recited Senſe. SECT. I.

Anſw. 2. WHEN he confutes the Senſe wherein Dr. *Criſp* explains a *Change of Perſon*, he muſt, in denying his Senſe, deny it under that Phraſe [Change of Perſon] of which the Doctor gave that Senſe. Take then the words of Dr. *Criſp*, " Chriſt him- " ſelf is not ſo compleatly righteous, but

SECT. I. "we are *as righteous as he*; nor we so "compleatly sinful, but Christ became "*as compleatly sinful as we*; that very Sin- "fulness we were, Christ is made *that ve- "ry Sinfulness* before God. So that here "is *a direct Change*; Christ takes our "Person and Condition, we take Christ's "Person and Condition;" with much more of this sort, as quoted, *pag.* 42. Here is the *Change of Person* which Dr. *Crisp* affirms; and this is the *Change* that Mr. *Williams* denies.

Answ. 3. Mr. *Williams* is so far from denying *a Change of Persons* in the general Sense, that in that Book he oft asserts and proves what the Orthodox intend by that Phrase, yea, in the very places where he denies *a Change of Person*. See *pag.* 41, 43. "Christ's sufferings and obedience "were *so in our stead*, that God cannot "exact from us any other atonement for "sin." *Pag.* 46. he thus explains the *Imputation* of Christ's sufferings: "To im- "pute to one what is suffered by ano- "ther, is to esteem the one *undertaken "for* in the sufferings of the other, and "to deal with him as if himself had suf- "fered the same things." And *pag.* 48. "Had not Christ suffered *for us*, we "could not have been absolved for the "sake of his sufferings." Again, *pag.* 52. "God hath provided for his *Justice and "Honour* [in saving true Christians] by

"the

"the Satisfaction of Chriſt." And *pag.* 270. "The *Puniſhment* of our Sins, "yea, the *Guilt* of them as an obliga- "tion to puniſhment, was laid upon Chriſt "*our Sponſor.*" See alſo *pag.* 8, 10, 15. What words can more diſtinctly and properly expreſs the Orthodox Senſe of *a Change of Perſons?* SECT. I.

Anſw. 4. HIS Cavils againſt Mr. *Williams*, pag. 9. as not affirming the Senſe of *a Change of Perſons*, though he ſay, *Chriſt ſuffered and died in our room and ſtead*, are weak and invidious: For,

(1.) Mr. *Williams*, when he had a fit occaſion, (as the *Reporter* knows,) duly aſſerts *Chriſt's Suretiſhip*, and proves, "That Chriſt ſuffered, not only *for our* "*good*, but *in our ſtead*; and that he was "a proper ἀντίψυχος, &c." See this inſiſted on at large, *Man made Righteous*, pag. 105, & *ſeq.*

(2.) THE *Racovian Catechiſm* in the *Amſterdam* Edition, and not only *modern Socinians*, affirm, *Chriſt died in our ſtead*; and *Socinus*, *Crellius*, and others, aſſerted *a Change of Perſons* between Chriſt and us: And the Senſe in which the firſt take *dying in our ſtead*, is as metaphorical and improper, as the laſt do take *a Change of Perſons* in. But if our *Reporter* finds a *Socinian* to uſe a Phraſe explained in an ill Senſe by themſelves, and others make uſe of that Phraſe in a contrary Senſe never ſo expreſs-

SECT. I. ly, his way is presently to charge upon them the use of that Phrase in the *Socinian* Sense. The same dealings towards him were equally just, when he useth the Phrases the *Antinomians* are wont to do.

(3.) AFTER all he hath said, to make the stress of our cause against the *Socinians*, to depend upon the Terms, *Change of Persons, &c.* an insight into that Controversy would convince him, that there are *other things* which do far more certainly *define* that Controversy about the Satisfaction; *viz.* Was Christ in his death an expiatory Sacrifice? Did he make atonement to the Justice of God? Did Christ endure the Punishment of our Sins? *&c.* All these Mr. *Williams* in *Gospel-Truth* asserts. To what is repeated before out of that Book, we will add, *pag.* 8. "Our Sins were "imputed to Christ with respect to the "Guilt thereof, so that he, by the Father's "appointment and his own consent, be-"came obliged, as Mediator, to bear the "Punishment of our Sins; and he did "bear those Punishments, to the full sa-"tisfaction of Justice, and to our actual "remission when we believe." If he that writes thus must *Socinianize*, none are free besides the *Antinomians*. But what can be safely said, in the opinion of the *Reporter*? who tells us, *pag.* 10. *It was a ridiculing* Dr. *Crisp*, when Mr. *Williams* shew-

ſhewing the ground of the Doctor's miſ- takes ſaith, *pag.* 57. "Becauſe Chriſt "ſuffered *in our ſtead*, that the fruit of "his ſuffering might be our deliverance "from ſuffering, and our being ſaved at "laſt; therefore he thinks, there is *a* "*Change of Perſon*:" Which very words do evidence plainly, that Mr. *Williams* by [*in our ſtead*,] allows the ſound Senſe of *a Change of Perſons*, while he oppoſeth Dr. *Criſp*'s erroneous Senſe of his *Change of Perſon*: And that Mr. *Williams* took a *Change of Perſon*, and a *Change of Perſons*, in a very different Senſe; though the *Diſputer*, or *Reporter*, ſeems not to diſtinguiſh between a *Surrogation*, upon which an innocent perſon expiates another's Crime, and his becoming the very ſinning Criminal; or, (to uſe his own Metaphor,) with him, He that is a Surety to pay the Drunkard's Debt, muſt in quality, nature, and condition, be the Drunkard too. SECT. I.

(4.) WHATEVER the *Reporter* ſaith *of the Scope, or offenſiveneſs, of that Book* of Mr. *Williams*'s, called, *Goſpel-Truth ſtated*; thoſe Brethren whom he calls *of biggeſt Name*, who ſubſcribed the *Firſt Paper*, have declared, They intended not by that Paper to cenſure the paſſages againſt which the *Diſſenters* objected; but were ſo far from condemning any paſſage therein, that they ſubſcribed the *Firſt Paper*, becauſe they were ſure, that upon enqui-

ry

SECT. I.

ry it would appear, there was nothing in that Book of Mr. *Williams*'s contrary to the Senſe of that *Firſt Paper*: And they ſtill as well as formerly declare, it is *an uſeful Book*, and that it is *the cauſe of Truth* it pleads; and have given it under their hands, that the *State of Truth and Error* is not at all enlarged or changed, ſince they firſt ſubſcribed; nor did they mean ſo in the *Firſt Paper*, but only that there were in the Book, beſides the *State of Truth and Error*, ſeveral Explications and Arguments added thereunto. Nor indeed could the *State of Truth and Error* be enlarged or changed, becauſe (as it is atteſted by ſeveral, even of thoſe Sixteen, that were the firſt who ſubſcribed to the firſt Edition,) the Book as far as it contained the *State of Truth and Error* was printed before they ſubſcribed the Atteſtation. Nor do we know of any of the Subſcribers of that Atteſtation, who do diſ-allow the ſaid Book; nor any, whoſe Names are affixed thereto without their conſent.

WE ſhall conclude with theſe further remarks.

Firſt, BESIDES the miſ-repreſentation, of the points in difference, and of the account given by us (in the *Third Paper*) of theſe Doctrines, &c. we could detect great miſtakes as to *Matters of Fact*. Some refuſed to ſubſcribe the *Firſt Paper*, as Mr. *Slater*; ſome, who ſay they never ſubſcribed

ed it, as Mr. *Barker*, are yet ſet down as Subſcribers; others are ſaid to expreſs their approbation of it, who vehemently declared their diſallowance of it, as Dr. *Anneſley*, &c. The *Reporter* ſaith, he cannot learn, there are *Five* Paſtors of Churches diſſenting from it; when it is notorious, to perſons more retired, that from the firſt about *Twenty* Paſtors of Churches aſſented not; yea, we know not one of our meeting who did ſubſcribe it, but were ſoon convinced that an Explication of it was needful, and therefore agreed to the *Third Paper*. Other miſtakes might be added. SECT. I.

Secondly, IT was unjuſt and diſingenuous, for the *Reporter* to publiſh this *Firſt Paper* with the Names of our Brethren affixed thereto. They, from a zeal for Union, condeſcended to prepare a way for it by ſubſcribing; but then they declared, they ſubſcribed not as their concluſive act, but agreed thereto upon condition the meeting of the *united Miniſters* would approve of it, and to whom they did wholly refer it. Yet he publiſheth it as a conſummate Inſtrument, (though the *Copy* was never delivered as ſuch, and the *Original* not at all,) and this without their conſent, and after he knew they had laid it aſide, and agreed to *another Paper* as the Inſtrument of Union. Such a courſe muſt miniſter Jealouſy, that the *Reporter*, when

SECT. I. when active in carrying on *that Paper*, did more design a Breach among the *United*, than Union with the *Dissenters*; and that his disappointment produceth this *Report*; when he saw our Union among ourselves consolidated of late, and that one of our Articles is to this effect, that *we will suffer none commonly called* Lay-men, *to preach in our Pulpits.*

Thirdly, THE *Reporter* hath no reason to glory in any of our Brethren's agreement with him in Doctrine, in any point wherein the *First Paper* differs from the *Third*: By which *Third Paper* they supply what was wanting, and explain what was doubtful, in the *First Paper*, and determine their sense of those Doctrines: Nor did they ever intend the weight of their Assertions should be laid upon any *unscriptural words*, but upon the orthodox sense of them, which *our Paper* stateth.

Fourthly, IT is matter of grief to us, that in opposition to the Preface of both Papers, *Law-terms* and *human Forms of speech*, in Doctrines so fully expressed in the Gospel, and capable of being expressed in the words used and appointed by the Holy Ghost, should be made *Engines of Division* among persons, who agree in the sense of such phrases, and yet dare not say, that God designed to limit or extend his Revelations by what such terms may signify in human Laws or Usages; especially when

when they need Explications and Limitations to prevent what is grosly erroneous. For instance, *Christ took upon him the Person of Sinners*; if it be taken in its extent, it will not only be true, that it was *of all Sinners*, but that he took upon him *all that belonged to Sinners* as such, and he was to be reputed *as sinful as they*, yea, as *all of them*: But the Churches of Christ have been wiser, than to insert such phrases into their *Confessions*; knowing it would confound the minds, and perplex the consciences of Christians, in points of greatest concernment to their Salvation. SECT. I.

Fifthly, THIS *Report* gives a pregnant instance, what *Zeal for a Party* will tempt men to; even, to misrepresent Persons and Things; to invent and applaud slight pretences against Union with their Brethren; to break all rules of Decency in praising or dispraising men, as their turn is served; to raise endless noise and clamours, let the juncture be never so unseasonable; nay, to cover and plead for the *Errors* of their Associates, which at other times they themselves have condemned.

THERE is occasion enough to invite our enlargement; but we design to irritate no man. The Vindication of ourselves from a printed Charge so severe, (as the perverting, denying, and making the Satisfaction of Christ impossible,) is so necessary, that all men must justify our publishing this

SECT. I.

this Defence. Without a Narrative of *matters of fact* as to doctrines, (for other things we omit,) transacted with the Brethren who left the Union, our Apology had been dark and imperfect; otherwise we had mentioned nothing of that kind. It is this *Reporter* must bear the blame, that we are compelled to say so much to convince the world, that if the Brethren had such a disposition to Peace, as we have all along expressed, the *Union* had never been broken; after they had made a *Breach*, we had soon re-united; and when a *Re-union* was refused by them, we yet had lived in quietness, and prevented their heats, which have stumbled the well-meaning, and advantaged our enemies, by producing such clamorous debates, and unjust reflections and misrepresentations.

WE have not to our knowledge omitted any thing consistent with integrity, to prevent our Breaches, or to heal them. Another *supplicatory Letter* to the Brethren for *Union* was written in Reply to the discouraging Answer they had given to our former; being contented to repeat those self-denying methods, which many would judge hardly meet or prudent. But this *Report* hath prevented the sending of *this Letter*, which was delayed by the time taken up in confirming the Union among ourselves.

IN

In this our *Answer to the Report*, we have for a *Re-union* proposed to subscribe the very Phrases they insist on; provided their Sense may be duly adjusted, and those plain Truths secured, upon which practical Godliness and a true Gospel-ministry so much depend. By which *Proposal* we hope, many of our *dissenting Brethren*, who have been imposed on, will be so undeceived, as to *re-unite* with us, and leave such to themselves who will still divide for the sake of such Errors as these Brethren cannot approve; and therefore will not, for the strengthening of their hands, be longer contented to bear the Imputation of those Opinions, and to contribute to the Propagation of them; neither of which can be avoided, if they continue to be of a Party with those, who so publickly plead for those Errors, and divide from us only for defending the opposite Truths. SECT. I.

Their own observation will furnish them with many more Arguments, at last to change their course; especially, if they will consider where it is like to end. It is already come to this pass, that with a stock of these Errors, their ignorant *Laymen* set up for the only Gospel-preachers, and are crouded after. Many of their own people are so infected, as to decry themselves for *Legalists*, when they dare preach of any thing besides Believers Priviledges, and the Priesthood of Christ. Such things

SECT. I. things cannot but affect all them, who mind the Intereſt of Chriſt above their own; of which number we are perſuaded many of the *Diſſenters* be, and will approve themſelves.

WE conclude, unfeignedly praying, that *the God of Peace* will increaſe all our Light and Love, that with a truly Chriſtian Spirit we may jointly ſerve the Intereſt of our common Lord.

SECT. II.

Reflections on the Remarks, &c. *annexed by the* Committee *to their* Anſwer *to the* Report.

WE ſhall add ſome *Reflections* on a Paper called, *Remarks, &c.* which ſoon followed the *Report*; and too much reſemble each other. But having already anſwered what is moſt material, a few further *Reflections* will ſuffice; and we ſhall ſpeak of the Authors as if but one man.

[1.] IT was needful to applaud the publiſhing his reported Paper, *as refreſhing to himſelf*, pag. 1. becauſe it is ſo offenſive to all ſerious Perſons; nor ſee we, how even he could be refreſhed thereby, further than as he glorieth in deceiving the ſimple, loves diviſions, and hath a proſpect of attaining

taining ſome miſchievous purpoſe by our Breaches. SECT. II.

[2.] THESE his Papers, inſtead of *removing*, do proclaim and fix *that Reproach* upon him and his adherents, *(pag. 6.) that they divide for dividing ſake, and know not about what they differ:* For he aſſigneth their Diviſions to one or two *mere words* or *Law-terms*, as to the ſyllables and letters, and not to the Senſe, upon which they will not openly fix their diſagreement. But if he would *remove this Reproach*, let him plainly and honeſtly contend for *their Errors* which we oppoſe, and no longer deceive the world by impertinently nibbling at *a few Expreſſions*, and from thence charging us with opinions, which, he is convinced, we all of us abhor. Only he thinks it will be a greater Reproach to acknowledge, they divide for ſuch horrid Errors, than that they *divide for dividing ſake*, and *differ about they know not what*; cuſtom and nature being ſome excuſe for both theſe.

[3.] THE confidence of this *Remarker* is more than ordinary, that can tell the world, *(pag. 7, 15.) that the Points in Controverſy are by his Paper made manifeſt; which*, he ſaith, *is about a Change of Perſons.* Whereas this *Change of Perſons* never was *the whole*, nor *any part* of the Controverſy between us. Not *a part*; for it is aſſerted expreſsly by all of us in the *Third*

SECT. II.

Paper, as ſoon as it was objected to us; and the ſound Senſe of it was affirmed in Mr. *Williams*'s Book long before. Far leſs was this *the whole* of the Controverſy; for tho' he accounts the bottom in the *Firſt Paper* to be *generous*, becauſe our Brethren therein made ſo little proviſion againſt the *Criſpian* Errors; yet we muſt mind him, *theſe Errors* gave riſe to our differences, and the abettors thereof ſtill refuſe to give us ſatisfaction; yea, even as to the moſt pernicious of their opinions.

[4.] SURE he is conſcious, what we muſt think of him, when he heaps ſo many words (*pag.* 7, 8, 9.) to ſhew, *that the Difference among us, concerning a Commutation of Perſons, is not about trifles, or matters of leſſer weight, but what is eſſential to Salvation.* He cannot blame us to ask, Is it the *mere phraſe*, [Change of Perſons,] or the *ſound ſenſe* of that phraſe, which, he ſaith, is *the Corner-ſtone of Chriſt's Satisfaction*, and what is ſo applauded by *Juſtin Martyr* and Dr. *Edwards*, &c. If it be the *mere phraſe*, all the Churches of Chriſt are condemned, becauſe their *Confeſſions* omit it. If it be the *ſenſe* of the *Reporter* and the *Criſpians*, then the Reverend Biſhop *Stillingfleet*, *Grotius*, Dr. *Edwards*, and our celebrated *Antiſocinian* Authors are in as bad a caſe as we, for they reject that ſenſe. But if it be the *ſound ſenſe* expreſſed by Dr. *Edwards*, as cited in the

Re-

Remarks, which deſerves theſe praiſes, this cannot be denied to us, no, not to Mr. *Williams*; for his Book aſſerts, not only *that Chriſt's blood was ſhed inſtead of ours*, and *his life went in exchange for ours*, and that *to ſatisfy Juſtice and anſwer the Law*; but alſo, *that Chriſt's Sufferings were Puniſhments*. You will preſently ſee the Judgment of the learned Dr. *Edwards*, whom he recites as a favourer of his cauſe againſt Mr. *Williams*. SECT. II.

[5.] If the *Congregational Brethren* have no more than *their ſigning the* Firſt Paper, *to clear them from the charge of Antinomianiſm*, they muſt ſtill abide under that charge, notwithſtanding all that is ſaid, *pag.* 9, 10, 11. The invalidity of the Reaſons he has offer'd will appear by our Anſwer to each.

(1.) How can their preſent Declaration of their *adhering to their approbation of the* Articles *of the* Church *of* England, *or to the* Confeſſions *of Faith*, &c. prove, *They are far from being tainted with Antinomianiſm?* when ſeveral of them have publiſhed their *Antinomian* opinions, both before and ſince the like Declaration.

(2.) They do ſtill affirm, that neither *Repentance* nor *Faith* are neceſſary to a Sinner's Pardon, or Juſtification before God; (but only follow that;) whatever they be to final Salvation: Nor doth this Paper ſay any thing againſt it.

SECT. II.

(3.) IT is palpably falſe, That the *Firſt Paper* affirms, "that God doth not par-"don, juſtify, or accept a Sinner, nor "entitle him to eternal Life, before the "Righteouſneſs of Chriſt be applied and "received by Faith:" It is ſtrange he ſaid not, before Repentance too: But it is not true, as to Faith itſelf. The Paper ſaith, *The only Righteouſneſs for the ſake of which God pardons, juſtifies, or accepts Sinners, or entitles them to eternal Life, is the alone Righteouſneſs of Chriſt without them, imputed to them, and received by Faith alone.* Note, he puts *applied* for *imputed*; which he would not ſay, is *by Faith:* And here is not ſo much, as that it is only the believing Sinner who is juſtified. But above all, he knows of his Party, who explains ſuch words by publiſhing, that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs when applied and received by Faith, is only for a manifeſtation to their Conſciences for their quiet, that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs had been applied to the Juſtification of their perſons before God, long before they believed. This is all the Juſtification by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, as received by Faith; but they were pardoned and entitled to Life as much before, though they knew it not: And this opinion the Paper denies not.

(4.) THE Paper ſaith, *Chriſt came into the room of Sinners, not to repent, or believe*

lieve for them, which the Goſpel requires. The *Remarker* knew, if the Goſpel requires theſe by its Precepts, it was a Slip overlook'd by ſuch of them who deny the Goſpel to be a Law; therefore he wordeth it, *The Elect are not exempt from an obligation of doing it themſelves.* But he as well knows, they hold, There is no obligation on them to repent or believe as a Condition or Term of obtaining any Benefit purchaſed by Chriſt; as to that, *they have nothing to do*: Alſo, That it was the Law of works, and that only, which commandeth Faith and Repentance *with any Sanction*: And the Paper contradicteth them not. SECT. II.

(5.) THO' the Paper ſaith, *There is not ſuch a* moral Change, *whereby Chriſt became* inherently ſinful, *and we immediately ſinleſs*; yet they do and may ſtill hold, That the *filth, fault, and fact of Sin* are ſo tranſacted *on Chriſt*, that he was in God's account *the very Criminal, the Blaſphemer, &c.* and that we are *as righteous as Chriſt* in equality: And the *legal Senſe* of the *Change* is ſuch, that we are legally reputed to have *made Satisfaction ourſelves* by obeying and dying; becauſe Chriſt did it in our perſons, and we did it in his perſon.

(6.) THE Paper ſaith, *The Father was not offended with Chriſt, much leſs abhorred him, conſidered as he was in himſelf; but as*

SECT. II.

in Relation to us, *as our* Surety; *and the Father was* diſpleaſed with Chriſt, *as the guilt of our Iniquities was laid upon him.* And he knows, his Friends do hold, That God was *diſpleaſed with* and abhorred *Chriſt*, becauſe of the *fault and filth of Sin upon him* as our *Surety*; which the Paper at leaſt forbids not. It's worth obſerving, that this Article was formed in oppoſition to one of the two only Errors objected here againſt Mr. *Williams*'s Book; whoſe words are theſe, *pag.* 34, 36. "That God teſti-"fied his threatned indignation againſt "Sin, in the awful Sufferings of Chriſt's "Soul and Body, *&c.* (and that Chriſt "endured the effects of God's wrath;) "yet the Father was not diſpleaſed with "Chriſt, much leſs abhorred him, becauſe "of the filthineſs of ſin upon him." Here's the Error, (and but once mentioned,) that required one of the three Articles to oppoſe it. Our *Third Paper* hath given them far more ground, to make this the point in Controverſy, than that of *Change of Perſons*, (which it aſſerts, both as to name and ſenſe:) But they inſiſt not on this, becauſe of the odious ſound of what they muſt aſſert in oppoſition to it. As to the *Remarker*'s hint from the *Aſſembly*'s words, that Chriſt endured *the weight of God's wrath*; let us mind him, that *Diſplicency* is oppoſed to complacential Love, and therefore none can be the object of God's diſpleaſure, but

one

one who is evil and wicked in the ſight of the Lord, and therefore *hateful to him* as ſuch: But the effects of God's rectoral wrath may fall on Chriſt, tho' beloved, as our *Surety*; yea, who was *not hated*, but *loved*, for dying according to his own voluntary engagements. Review theſe things, and judge what a poor Vindication from *Antinomianiſm* the *Firſt Paper* affordeth: Unleſs they think, he muſt be far enough from this Error, that owneth the *Law of works* to be in full force, and the only Law; altho' they alſo hold, that the Elect have fulfilled this Law perfectly in Chriſt, and therefore are themſelves to yield no ſort of obedience in order to any benefit, or preventing of any puniſhment. Here's all the Zeal for the Law, which they think enough to acquit them from being *Antinomians*; and all who think that *we under the Goſpel* are any further obliged, are to be *Neonomians*. But yet, SECT. II.

(7.) As great a Liberty as this Paper gives *Antinomians* to ſubſcribe it; obſerve, in what a faint and dark manner they do ſubſcribe even this poor defence: Their words are, *We are glad to find ſo good an Agreement among us as this Paper doth expreſs*. This is all. But wherein? or how far? or under what limitations? or in hopes of what future advances, *this Agreement* is to be conſtrued? they have reſerved ſufficient liberty to explain, as occaſion offers;

SECT. II. and cannot deny the Reader a leave to gueſs, eſpecially when he ſeeth the *Reporter* already to differ ſo very much from our Brethren, in his explication of a *Change of Perſons*, and other things contained in that Paper. But yet further,

(8.) As poor a defence againſt *Antinomianiſm* as the Paper is, if plainly aſſented to; and as mere a nullity as the Subſcription is; there were ſeveral of the *Congregational*, who would not do even thus much, and refuſed to ſet their hands to this: Which the *Reporter* well knows, whatever Art he hath uſed to hear what they all have done.

MAY not we hope upon ſo plain evidence, That ſuch of our *Congregational* Brethren as are not *Antinomians*, will be convinced, it's neceſſary to do yet more for their Vindication, than thus *ſigning this Paper?* ſeeing that, not only they *who are far from being tainted with this Poiſon*, but they who are moſt infected, may ſafely ſubſcribe as it requires; and even they have done, who in the adjuſting of this Paper could not be brought to grant, that *Regeneration is neceſſary* to bring us into a good State.

[6.] NOTWITHSTANDING his compliment to a few Subſcribers, *pag.* 12, 13, 15. *The* Preſbyterians *need not ſubſcribe the* Firſt Paper *to acquit them from the* Socinian *ſlander, that they are* Arminians; No, nor yet

yet from the *Reporter*'s ſlander, that they are *Socinians*. They have done it more effectually, in the publiſhed *Agreement in Doctrine*, 1692. They have done it yet more, in the *Articles* of 1694. which had been alſo publiſhed, if theſe *Diſſenters* could have cleared themſelves of *Antinomianiſm*, as the *Preſbyterians* did of *Arminianiſm*. Yea, they have done it as fully by the *Third Paper*, as can be by the *Firſt*; for that retains the ſame words in the Head of Juſtification, and in all the reſt, as far as they oppoſe *Arminianiſm*. Nay, do not we and Mr. *Williams*'s Book, aſſert Chriſt's Sufferings to be *a Puniſhment* in *Satisfaction to punitive Juſtice?* which the *Remarker*, *pag.* 14, 15. declares to be the diſtinguiſhing point. Are not our words, "Chriſt "came *into our room and ſtead* to die, to "anſwer for our violations of the Law of "works; and that the *Puniſhment of our* "*Sins* was inflicted on Chriſt, that God "might, without injury to his Juſtice or "Honour, pardon Sinners for his Satis-"faction?" What a ſlanderous Spirit acteth this man, that makes *Chriſt's Satisfaction to punitive Juſtice*, to be that which diſtinguiſheth the *Arminians* and *Socinians* from the Orthodox? and yet ranketh us among the former, tho' he knows, all of us aſſented to the *Third Paper*, which affirmeth *Chriſt's Sufferings* were *a Satisfaction to punitive Juſtice.*

SECT. II.

[7.] BUT

SECT. II.

[7.] BUT *how long* will this man acquit any of the *Preſbyterians*, from the ſlander of being *Arminians*, and *Socinians* too? He is ſure, the world will ſoon know, that even they of our Brethren, who ſubſcribed the *Firſt Paper*, have ſeveral of them framed, and the others aſſented to, the *Third Paper*, as an Explication of their Senſe of the *Firſt*. The *Reporter* ſaith, the *Third Paper* perverts and denies the *Satisfaction of Chriſt*, in the Account given of a *Change of Perſons*: If ſo, he muſt account theſe Brethren hereafter, no other than *Arminians* and *Socinians*, in common with the reſt of us; perhaps he'll proclaim them *Apoſtates* too, for not adhering to the *Firſt Paper*, in oppoſition to the *Third*. And he is too well known, for us to doubt that when it ſerves his turn, no *Preſbyterian* ſhall be found in the Faith, becauſe he is not a *Criſpian* in Doctrine.

[8.] ALL his artifice (*pag.* 15, 16.) hath not, nor ever can reduce the Controverſy among us into a narrower room than this; Is *Repentance* required by the Goſpel, in order to the Forgiveneſs of Sin? and *Faith in Chriſt*, in order to the Juſtification of our Perſons before God? Unleſs he'll reduce it to this, Is any *Duty* on man's part required by the Goſpel in order to his obtaining any ſaving benefit, or any kind of *Sin* a bar to his title to any ſuch benefits

benefits by the Goſpel-conſtitution? Here's the Controverſy, and the *Third Paper* is refuſed, becauſe it is expreſs for the affirmative beyond the *Firſt*. SECT. II.

[9.] We are ſorry we have ſo much reaſon to fear, that if this pretended point of a *Change of Perſons* were accommodated to the *Criſpians* liking, Mr. *Lobb* would find ſome occaſion to continue our heats and diviſions; wherein he had the greateſt hand, under the name of a *Pacificator*, as ſoon as other Agents became a little quiet. What deſign he propoſeth, or ſome others by him, if detrimental to the common Good, we hope, God will diſappoint it, and at laſt favour ſuch who may be *repairers of our breach*, and *reſtorers of paths to dwell in*.

Reader, Note, that our *Anſwer* comes out ſo late, becauſe the *Reporter* publiſhed his Paper, when he knew our meetings were laid down, and that we were not to come together till *September*.

SECT.

SECT. III.

An Account of the Second Paper, *mentioned in the* Report *and* Anſwer.

SECT. III. THE *Report* and *Anſwer* make mention of a *Second Paper*; which, to render the whole matter more plain, is here annexed, with the Occaſion of it.

Septemb. 7. 1696. AT a meeting of the *united Miniſters*, Mr. *Williams* ſpake to this effect: " Mr. *Moderator*, I hear by " ſome perſons, that ſince our receſs, there " is a diſpoſition in ſome of the *Congrega-* " *tional Brethren* to Peace, if not to *Re-* " *union*; and that the only pretended ob- " ſtacle is the want of ſatisfaction con- " cerning the Orthodoxneſs of all of us in " the Points of *Juſtification*, *Commutation* " *of Perſons*, and *the Father's diſpleaſure* " *with Chriſt*. For their diſſatisfaction, " they inſtance ſomewhat out of my " Book as a denial of a *Commutation of* " *Perſons*, and inſinuate as if the other " two were not duly aſſerted. All pro- " poſals for *Re-union* ſhould begin with " this Board; nor ought particular Mem- " bers to conclude themſelves in a matter " of this kind, till you are conſulted. But

" though,

" though, I confeſs, I know not what SECT.
" can be juſtly offered which we have not III.
" done already, and all that concerns my
" Book is long ſince adjuſted; yet that
" nothing may ſeem wanting on our part
" to promote Peace, I would not loſe the
" advantage of their preſent inclination to
" it. And being that only my Book is
" objected againſt, I have drawn up in
" this Paper the heads of a Propoſal, to
" be ſent to *Pinner's Hall*, which I ſubmit
" to the Judgment of this Board."

That called *the Second Paper.*

THE *Preface* is made up of what is cited above, *(pag.* 325, 326.) out of the *Agreement*, 1692; and what is in the Preface of the *Firſt* and *Third* Papers. The Three Doctrinals are in theſe Words. " We declare,

" I. OF *Juſtification:* As the Goſpel
" plainly requireth *Repentance towards*
" *God* in order to a Sinner's partaking of
" the Remiſſion of Sins, and *Faith in our*
" *Lord Jeſus* in order to Juſtification, and
" a *godly Converſation* in order to eternal
" Glory; promiſing Juſtification and For-
" giveneſs of Sin to all penitent Believers,
" and eternal Life to ſuch as perſevere in
" Faith and true Holineſs; and alſo de-
" claring all impenitent Unbelievers (while
" ſuch) to be in a ſtate of Condemnation:
" So by the ſame Goſpel it is evident, that
" *none of theſe*, nor any Work done by

" Men,

SECT. III.

" Men, or wrought by the Spirit of God " in them, are, under any denomination, " *any part of that Righteouſneſs*, for the " ſake, or on the account whereof, any " Bleſſing is merited or procured, much " leſs Juſtification or eternal Life: But " God juſtifies, pardons, accepts, and en- " titles Sinners to eternal Life, only for " the ſake of *the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt* " without them, imputed to them, and " received by Faith alone.

" II. OF *Commutation of Perſons*: " Whereas Sinners were obnoxious to ſuf- " fer the Puniſhments threatned by the " Law for their tranſgreſſions; the *Lord* " *Jeſus* by his compact with the Father, " became *our mediating Surety*; and as " ſuch, he obeyed the Law, and our Pu- " niſhments were judicially transferred on " him, which for our Redemption he en- " dured *in our room and ſtead*, to the Sa- " tisfaction of Juſtice, that we might be " juſtified when we believe, and be dealt " with accordingly. Nevertheleſs we " deny, that by a *Commutation of Perſons* " there is ſuch a *reciprocal Change of Con-* " *dition* betwixt Chriſt and Sinners, or " ſuch an imputation, or tranſlation of " qualities, as implies, that Chriſt was *as* " *ſinful as we*, and we *as righteous as* " *Chriſt*. And though we aſſert, that " Chriſt hath undertaken, the Elect ſhall " in due time repent and believe; yet we " deny,

" deny, that Chriſt came into the room of SECT.
" the Elect to repent or believe for them, III.
" or that Believers are accounted to have
" done and ſuffered what Chriſt did, or
" that they are juſtified by the Law of
" works.—See more in the next Head.

" III. OF *the Father's being diſpleaſed* " *with Chriſt:* (Tho' the Phraſe be not pro-
" per, yet we declare,) That the *Lord Jeſus*
" having engaged in the Covenant of Re-
" demption, as our mediating Surety, to *ſuffer*
" *the Puniſhment of our Sins* for the expiat-
" ing thereof, He did *bear the guilt of our*
" *Iniquities*, ſo as to ſuffer as Sinners ſuffer,
" and to be dealt with as God threatned
" to deal with them whom he is diſpleaſ-
" ed with, as far as was conſiſtent with
" Chriſt's being innocent, and one who
" became ſubject to thoſe Puniſhments by
" his own conſent, in Obedience to the
" Father, and for the Redemption of Sin-
" ners. And therefore, Chriſt was *under*
" *the wrath of God*, as that was his Will
" to puniſh him; yea, he *endured the*
" *weight of that wrath* in the puniſhment
" of our Sins; which Sins, as to the obli-
" gation to endure thoſe puniſhments, were
" laid on Chriſt: *It pleaſed the Lord to*
" *bruiſe him*, having *laid on him the Ini-*
" *quities of us all.* But we deny, that
" our Sins, as to their *filth* or *fault*, were
" transferred on Chriſt; or that he was
" *inherently*, or *in legal eſteem*, or looked on

" by

SECT. III.

" by the Father as *one contrary to his* " *holy nature and Will*, either as he was " our Surety, or in any other reſpect. And " therefore, if by *diſpleaſed with Chriſt* is " meant, that the Father *hated* or *abhorred* " *Chriſt* (which is proper only to one evil " in the ſight of the Lord,) becauſe of " our Sins imputed to him; ſo the Father " *was not diſpleaſed with Chriſt:* But on " the contrary, the Father was *always* " *well-pleaſed* with him, at all times ac- " counting him (even as our High Prieſt,) " *holy, harmleſs, undefiled, and ſeparate* " *from Sinners*; and therefore ſuch, when " he offer'd himſelf an expiating Sacrifice; " yea, that for this he loved him."

THEN follows Mr. *Williams*'s Concurrence in theſe three Points, with Citations at large out of his Book, that he had oft affirmed the very ſame, and that the places objected did not all contradict any of theſe things.

AND then it is further declared, " That " as he had oft propoſed it, ſo now he is " willing to an *Union* with the *diſſenting* " *Brethren*, either by mutual forbearance, " wherein we differ in Judgment; or if " ſatisfaction be inſiſted on as to any other " expreſſions, that have been or ſhall " be objected out of any of his Books, " (where he knows nothing but what is " orthodox,) he is willing to give it, in " the ſame time and manner as Mr. *Cole*,

" Mr.

" Mr. *Mather*, Mr. *Chauncy*, Mr. *Trayl*, SECT.
" *&c.* ſhall be obliged to give ſatisfaction III.
" as to many material exceptions he hath
" made, and ſhall yet make, to what
" they have publiſhed in their Books. But
" otherwiſe he will no farther concern him-
" ſelf, but keep to the Vote paſs'd, *Sept.* 15.
" 1695. notwithſtanding that now for
" Peace-ſake, he hath waved the demand
" thereof, in anſwering the above men-
" tioned Exceptions, when they are not
" required to do the like."

LASTLY, There is the Form of words for the Subſcribers of Mr. *Williams*'s Book, which you have before, *pag.* 325. cited out of the *Agreement*, 1692; only with this Addition, " That Mr. *Williams* did
" not write his Book, nor they ſubſcribe
" the Approbation, with any deſign to op-
" poſe our *Congregational Brethren* as ſuch,
" or to divide from them."

THIS Paper was read and received; but Mr. *Williams* deſired it might be waved, when a Propoſal was made by a Subſcriber of the *Firſt Paper*, that we ſhould draw up the *Third Paper* out of this and another Paper, called the *Firſt*; which were both voted to be laid aſide, altho' that called the *Firſt Paper* was never read in the Meeting, nor once propoſed to be received there.

SECT. IV.

Letters of the Biſhop of Worceſter, *and Dr.* Edwards, *to Mr.* Williams.

SECT. IV. A LETTER from the Right Reverend Dr. *Stillingfleet*, Biſhop of *Worceſter*, in Anſwer to one from Mr. *Williams*, who deſired his Judgment as to the following Queſtions; becauſe his Lordſhip's Book is pleaded againſt Mr. *Williams*, in the *Firſt Paper*, and the *Report*.

SIR,

I RETURN you Thanks for the Papers you were pleaſed to ſend me, by which I am able to underſtand ſomething more than formerly, of the preſent ſtate of the Difference about *the Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us*: But I ſhall meddle no farther in it, than I am obliged to do in Anſwer to the Queſtions you propoſe to me. And I wiſh I may be able to do any ſervice therein.

THE *Firſt Queſtion* is, about *my Senſe* of *Commutation of Perſons*. It is ſaid in the *Firſt Paper*, "That I do, with *Grotius*, "expreſsly

" expreſsly affirm, and irrefragably prove SECT.
" it, in concurrence with the common ſen- IV.
" timent of *Proteſtants*; and that the Doc-
" trines of *Juſtification* and *Chriſt's Satis-*
" *faction*, cannot be duely explained and
" defended, conſiſtently with the Denial of
" any *Commutation of Perſons* between
" Chriſt and Believers."

THIS had been fairly repreſented, in caſe there could be no other Senſe of *Commutation of Perſons* than what is aſſerted by Dr. *Criſp*; but there is a threefold Senſe of it, very different from each other.

(1.) SUCH a *Change of Perſons*, as implies that one is appointed and allowed to act *on behalf of others*, and *for their advantage*. And this ſort of *Commutation of Perſons* the *Socinians* never denied; as I have ſhewed in the *Diſcourſe of Satisfaction*, pag. 62, 190, 191. It is not therefore the Uſe of the Words, but the Senſe of them is to be enquired into. For ſome may affirm *a Change of Perſons*, and yet be *Socinians*; and others may deny *a Change*, and be far enough from *Socinianiſm*, according to the Senſe in which they are underſtood.

(2.) SUCH a *Change of Perſons*, as ſuppoſes one to be *ſubſtituted in the place of others*, to become an Atonement for them in order to their Redemption and Deliverance. And when ſuch a *Subſtitution* is by the Will of God, and Conſent of the

SECT. IV. Perſon who ſuffers; here is a real *Change of Perſons* as to that particular End which is deſigned by it. And in this Senſe I did aſſert *a Change of Perſons* between Chriſt and us, becauſe by the Will of the Father and his own Conſent, he became a Sacrifice of Propitiation for our Sins, in order to their Remiſſion, and our Reconciliation with God, on ſuch Terms as are declared in the Goſpel; as may be ſeen at large in the *Diſcourſe* already mentioned; particularly, *Chap.* iv. §. 4.

(3.) SUCH a *Change of Perſons*, as implies an *actual Tranſlation* of the *perſonal Guilt* of all the Sins of Believers on Chriſt, and of his *perſonal Righteouſneſs* on them, without regard to any Conditions on their part, but merely by the free Grace and favour of God. And this I take to be Dr. *Criſp*'s Senſe of the *Change of Perſons*; of which I ſhall diſcourſe, when I come to the laſt Queſtion.

BUT the Authors of the *Firſt Paper*, and of the *Report*, *pag.* 4. ſeem to take it for granted, that there can be but *one Senſe* of *Commutation of Perſons*; wherein they do not diſcover their profound Knowledge in theſe matters, if they thought ſo; or their Ingenuity, if they knew otherwiſe, and deſigned to impoſe upon thoſe who did not. For it appears, that there is *a Senſe*, in which it may, and ought to be denied, without the leaſt prejudice

judice to the Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction: And tho' that *cannot be explained, or defended, without* ſome kind of *Commutation of Perſons*; yet it very well may, and ought to be defended, without and againſt Dr. *Criſp*'s Senſe of it; as will be made appear afterwards. SECT. IV.

The Author of the *Report*, *pag.* 5. ſaith, "This is *the very Hinge*, on which the "Controverſy between the *Orthodox* and "*Socinians* doth turn;" which ſhews him to be not very deeply ſkilled in it. For *the Hinge of the Controverſy* is not about the Words, but the Senſe of *Commutation of Perſons*. And even the Senſe is not the original Controverſy, but *conſequential*, upon our aſſerting Chriſt's Sacrifice to be a Propitiation for our Sins: For upon this they aſk, How the Act of one Perſon can be ſo beneficial to others? and to that we anſwer, That tho' one man's Act cannot become another's, yet if by Conſent both of the Father and Son, he becomes our Mediator, and *ſuffers in our ſtead*, in order to our Reconciliation, *then* as to that End and Purpoſe, here is a *Change of Perſons*: For, whereas in ſtrictneſs we ought to have ſuffered the deſert of our own Sins, God was pleaſed to accept of *his ſuffering inſtead of ours*; and ſo by virtue of that Propitiation, we hope for the Remiſſion of Sins and the Favour of God, according to the Terms of the Goſpel. And therein conſiſts

SECT. IV.

the true Controverſy between the *Socinians* and us: *viz.* Whether the Sufferings of Chriſt were to be conſidered as a Puniſhment for our Sins, and as a Propitiatory Sacrifice to God for them; or only as an Act of Dominion over an Innocent Perſon, in order to his advancement to Glory.

BUT it is ſaid in the *Report*, *pag.* 5. "That if there be *no Change of Perſons* "between Chriſt and us, there can be *no* "*Tranſlation of the Guilt*, nor a juſt in-"fliction of the *Puniſhment* of our Sins "on Chriſt; that is, there can be *no pro-*"*per Satisfaction.*"

To this I anſwer, That there is a two-fold *Tranſlation of Guilt* to be conſidered:

1. OF the *Perſonal Guilt*, which reſults from the acts of Sin committed by ſuch perſons. If *this Guilt* be tranſlated, Chriſt muſt become *the very Perſon* who committed the Sins; and ſo he muſt be looked on, not only as an actual Sinner, but as the Perſon that committed all the Sins of thoſe for whom he died: Which comes ſo near to horrid Blaſphemy, that I wonder, perſons that bear any reverence to our bleſſed Saviour, do not abhor the very thoughts of it.

2. OF *Legal Guilt*, which lies in the Obligation to Puniſhment, by virtue of the Sanction of the Divine Law. Now *this Guilt* implies two things;

(1.) THE

(1.) THE *Deſert of Puniſhment*, which follows Perſonal Guilt, and cannot be transferred by a *Change of Perſons:* For no man can ceaſe to deſerve Puniſhment for his own faults; nor deſerve that another ſhould be puniſhed for them. SECT. IV.

(2.) THE *Obligation to undergo* the deſerved *Puniſhment:* But becauſe the execution of Puniſhment depends, both on the wiſdom and juſtice of the Legiſlator; therefore here a *Change of Perſons* may intervene, and by the Wiſdom and Juſtice of God a Mediator may be accepted in ſuch a manner as himſelf determines; and upon the Acceptance of his Sacrifice the Offenders may be pardoned and received into the grace and favour of God, on ſuch Terms as he hath declared in the Goſpel. And *in this Senſe* the Guilt of our Sins was charged upon Chriſt as our Mediator, who was to bear the Puniſhment of our Sins; ſo as by virtue of his Sufferings, we may not only hope to eſcape the juſt Puniſhment of our offences, but to be admitted to the Privileges of the Children of God.

BUT the *Reporter* out of a certain *Manuſcript* gives another Account of *Commutation of Perſons*, viz. "That *Commutation* "in a legal ſenſe is the ſame with *a proper* "*Surrogation*, where the Surety *puts on* "*the Perſon*, and ſtands in the quality, "ſtate, and condition of the Debtor, and "lies under the ſame Obligation to anſwer "for him."

SECT. IV.

BUT this I have ſhewed long ſince to be a very wrong notion of *Chriſt's Satisfaction*; and which in effect gives up the Cauſe to the *Socinians*: For if *Sins* be conſidered *as Debts*, God may freely forgive them (without diſparagement to his Wiſdom and Juſtice) without any Satisfaction; and the Right of Puniſhment then depends on God's abſolute Dominion; and Satisfaction muſt be by way of Compenſation; of which I have treated at large, *Chap.* i. §. 2, *ult.* But I cannot but wonder at the learned Author of the *Manuſcript*, that he doth at the ſame time aſſert our *Sins* to be conſidered *as Debts*, and the *Neceſſity of vindictive Juſtice*: For, what *vindictive Juſtice* belongs to a *Creditor?* May not a *Creditor* part with his own Right, and forgive what and whom he pleaſes, without any violation of Juſtice? I can hardly think, that thoſe who write ſo rudely and inconſiſtently, ever penetrated into theſe matters in their own thoughts; but only take up with a Set of Phraſes and common Expreſſions among thoſe they converſe with, which they look on as the ſtandard and meaſure of Truth about theſe matters.

BUT he finds fault with ſome men, *who hold that Chriſt only ſuffered in the Perſon of a Mediator, and not in the Perſon of Sinners.* What is the Meaning of this? I had thought, that a *Mediator* interpoſing

for

for that end, that by his Sufferings there might be a Propitiation for ſins, did ſo far *ſuſtain the Perſon of Sinners*, as to take upon himſelf the Puniſhment of their ſins, and procure grace and favour for them. But if he means any thing beyond this, he muſt explain himſelf. *Chriſt ſuffered in the Perſon of Sinners:* Is it, that he ſuffered, that others might not ſuffer? That is not denied by thoſe, *who ſay that Chriſt ſuffered in the Perſon of a Mediator:* For a Mediator is a publick Perſon, and acts *in the ſtead* and on the behalf of others; and if this be called *ſuſtaining the Perſon of Sinners*, I ſuppoſe they will not quarrel with the Expreſſion. But if more be meant by it, *viz.* that the *Perſonal Guilt* of Sinners, in Dr. *Criſp*'s Senſe, is *transferred upon Chriſt*, that they have to deny; as I hope to make it appear in Anſwer to the third Queſtion. SECT. IV.

THE *Second Queſtion* is, Whether the Author of *Goſpel-Truth ſtated*, viz. Mr. *Williams*, be chargeable with *Socinianiſm*, in what he ſaid, *pag.* 41, 44?

THE Charge ſtands thus in the *Report*, *pag.* 4. "That he ſaith, there is *no* "*Change of Perſons* beween Chriſt and "Sinners;" which is there ſaid to be "inconſiſtent with the Doctrine of *Chriſt's* "*Satisfaction*, which muſt ſuppoſe *a Commutation of Perſons*; and therefore he "that

SECT. IV.

" that *denies any Change*, cannot aſſert the " Doctrine of *Satisfaction*."

THIS is the force of the Objection. And being deſired to give my Opinion of it, I examin'd and compared ſeveral paſſages in that Book, that I might judge truly and impartially concerning it. And I found the Author, *pag.* 4. ſaying concerning the Difference with Dr. *Griſp*, " It was not, " *whether Chriſt had made full Atonement* " *for ſin*;" which he there owns to be his ſenſe. And *pag.* 8. more fully he owns, that " our Sins were *imputed to Chriſt* " with reſpect to the *Guilt thereof*; ſo " that he, by the Father's appointment, " and his own Conſent, *became obliged*, as " Mediator, *to bear the Puniſhments* to the " full Satisfaction of Juſtice, and to our " actual Remiſſion when we believe." Can any thing be more clear and expreſs againſt *Socinianiſm*, than this? There are other paſſages, *pag.* 11, 21, 30, *&c.* to the ſame purpoſe; but theſe are ſufficient to ſhew, that he could not abſolutely deny *any Commutation of Perſons.*

BUT in what words doth he deny it? For it is poſſible, there may be ſuch words uſed, as may reſtrain and limit the Senſe; and then it is very hard to force ſuch a Senſe upon them, as is inconſiſtent with what he had ſaid before; for no man loves to contradict himſelf; eſpecially when he knows what advantage will be taken

taken by it. The words are theſe, *pag.* 44. " The Difference lies in theſe points: " (1.) Whether there be *a Change of Perſon* between Chriſt and the Elect; yea, " or betwixt Chriſt and Believers? This " the Doctor affirms, and I deny." How can any Perſons, in common Ingenuity, underſtand this otherwiſe, than that he *denied* ſuch a *Change of Perſons* as Dr. *Criſp* affirmed? But againſt this it is urged by the Author of the *Manuſcript*, in the *Report*, pag. 18. " That his *Denial of a* " *Change of Perſons*, is ſo expreſs and full, " as leaves no room for any diſtinction, li- " mitation, or reſtriction, or for an own- " ing it in any Senſe." What! not in the Senſe that himſelf had owned it in before? This is very hard; eſpecially when he mentions *what the Doctor affirmed, and he denied.* There is a very good paſſage to this purpoſe in the *Firſt Paper*, mentioned in the *Report*, pag. 12. *Not thinking it reaſonable or juſt, to charge upon any Brother ſuch Conſequences of any expreſſion or opinion of his, which he himſelf ſhall diſown.* Why then ſhould ſuch a Senſe be charged upon him, which he *diſowns* at the ſame time? There muſt be ſomething farther in this Matter, than appears to an indifferent and impartial Reader; what it is, is no part of my buſineſs to enquire.

SECT. IV.

BUT that which muſt give the beſt Light

SECT. IV. Light into it, will be the resolution of the last Question.

THE *Third Question* is, concerning Dr. *Crisp's Sense* of the *Change of Persons*, whether it be true or false? Which, I suppose, is truly set down by the Author of *Gospel-Truth stated*, in these words, pag. 42. "*Mark it well, Christ himself* "*is not so compleatly righteous, but we are* "as righteous as he; *nor we so compleatly* "*sinful, but Christ became, being made* "*Sin*, as sinful as we: *Nay more, we* "*are the same Righteousness; for we are* "*made the Righteousness of God; that very* "*Sinfulness that we were, Christ is made* "that very Sinfulness *before God. So that* "*here is* a direct Change; *Christ takes our* "*Person and Condition, and stands in our* "*stead; and we take Christ's Person, and* "*stand in his stead.*"

HERE is indeed *a Change of Persons* supposed; but I do not find it proved; and therefore is only to be look'd on as an *imaginary Change*, which it is possible for men to fancy: But that is no ground to build a Matter of Faith upon; and such as the Salvation of their Souls is so nearly concerned in. But to deliver my Opinion freely and distinctly about it, I shall shew, [1.] That it hath no Foundation in Scripture. [2.] That it is contrary to the Tenor of it, and the Terms of Salvation contained

tained in the Goſpel. And, [3.] That it is attended with very bad Conſequences, which naturally follow from it. SECT. IV.

[1.] THAT it hath no Foundation in Scripture. For which I deſire it may be conſidered, that our bleſſed Saviour himſelf in all his preaching, who came to reveal the Will of God to mankind, ſaith nothing at all of it: And can any poſſibly think, that he would omit ſuch a Point, wherein, I perceive, ſome do think *the Subſtance of the Goſpel* is contained? All that our Saviour ſaith to this purpoſe, is, That *he came to give his Life a Ranſom for many*; Mat. xx. 28. and that *his Blood was ſhed for many for the Remiſſion of ſins.* Mat. xxvi. 28. What other *Change of Perſons* is herein implied, but that of *a Ranſom*, and *a Sacrifice of Propitiation?* He that knew beſt for what End he ſuffered, ſaith not one word of his taking upon himſelf the *Perſon of Sinners*, in any other ſenſe than as he ſuffered in their ſtead, and for their advantage. Here is nothing like *his being as compleatly ſinful as we*; and *our being made as righteous as he.* And yet certainly he communicated to his Diſciples thoſe Points on which their Juſtification and Salvation depended. But how could they apprehend any ſuch *Change of Perſons* in this ſenſe, from any words uſed by himſelf to them? And all neceſſary Points of Faith were deliver'd by our Saviour to his Diſciples;

SECT. IV.

ples: And therefore to make ſuch a *Change of Perſons* neceſſary, and yet not mentioned by him, is to charge him with failing in his *Prophetical Office*, which all thoſe ought to conſider, who lay ſuch ſtreſs upon this matter.

BUT doth not *St. Paul* ſay, that *God hath made him to be Sin for us, who knew no ſin, that we might be made the Righteouſneſs of God in him?* 2 Cor. v. 21. I grant he doth ſo. But *do not theſe words imply ſuch a* Change of Perſons *as Dr.* Criſp *aſſerts?* By no means: Which I thus prove. Dr. *Criſp's* notion of *the Change of Perſons*, ſuppoſes the benefits of this Change to be antecedent to any Conditions on our ſide, *viz.* that it was by a Tranſaction between the Father and the Son, without regard to any Act of ours: But when the Apoſtle ſpeaks of *Chriſt's being made ſin for us*, and *our being made the righteouſneſs of God in him*; he ſuppoſes, that before we can have the benefit of it, we muſt be firſt *reconciled to God*, which is an Act on our part. For to this purpoſe he ſaith, *ver.* 18, 19. that after *the Reconciliation* made *by Chriſt* at his Death, he had *given* to the Apoſtles *the Miniſtry of Reconciliation.* To what purpoſe? Was it only to let them know, what Chriſt had already done for mankind? That were to ſet up a *Miniſtry of Conſolation* for *Believers*; but not *of Reconciliation.* But

the

the Apoſtle lays great force upon it, that *God had committed to them the Word of Reconciliation. Now then*, ſaith he, ver. 20. *we are Ambaſſadors for Chriſt, as though God did beſeech you by us, we pray you in Chriſt's ſtead, be ye reconciled to God.* They were by this *Miniſtry of Reconciliation*, after what Chriſt had done and ſuffered, *prayed*, and with great earneſtneſs, *to be reconciled to God?* To what End? when according to *this Change of Perſons*, they were *more than reconciled to God already*, if they were true Believers; for they were *as righteous as Chriſt himſelf*, and therefore muſt be in the grace and favour of God. If they were not Believers, then, according to this Scheme of the *Change of Perſons*, they could have no benefit by it; and conſequently, *this Miniſtry of Reconciliation* is wholly ſubverted, as to the great purpoſe and deſign of it; for either they were *reconciled* already, or they never could be. And yet the Apoſtle, after thoſe words in *ver.* 21. immediately ſubjoins, *Chap.* vi. 1. *We then as workers together with him, beſeech you alſo, that ye receive not the Grace of God in vain.* What can the meaning of theſe words be, if Dr. *Criſp's* Senſe of the *Change of Perſons* hold good? Can they who are *compleatly righteous*, ever *receive the Grace of God in vain?* And to what purpoſe doth he ſpeak of *their working together*

SECT. IV.

SECT. IV.

gether with God, and *beſeeching them* not to do a thing utterly impoſſible? for it would be to undo what had long ſince been done between the Father and the Son in the *Change of Perſons*. So that this notion of the *Change of Perſons* is as different from *St. Paul's*, as may be; for that ſuppoſes no conditions on our ſide; and the *Miniſtry of Reconciliation* in *St. Paul*, is wholly founded upon it, and really ſignifies nothing, as to the Ends he propoſes, without it. For to what purpoſe is that appointed to perſuade men to be *reconciled to God*, if all that ever ſhall be admitted to Heaven were long ſince *reconciled* at the Death of Chriſt, and they were made *as compleatly righteous as Chriſt himſelf?*

IT may be ſaid, *That the Miniſtry of Reconciliation is not uſeleſs, becauſe it is the means whereby God doth effectually convey his Grace into the Hearts of Believers.* But this cannot ſatisfy any one that conſiders *St. Paul's* expreſſions: For his words are, *We pray you in Chriſt's ſtead, be ye reconciled to God.* If he had ſaid, *That God had made Chriſt to be ſin for you already, and you as righteous as Chriſt was*; how would it have looked to have ſaid after this, *We pray you to be reconciled to God?* For, what need they any *Reconciliation*, who were already ſo much in his favour?

BUT *is there no Change of Perſons then implied*

implied in those words of St. Paul; *He hath made him to be Sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the Righteousness of God in him?* Yes certainly: Such a *Change*, whereby Christ did undergo *the Punishment of our sins.* And so *Erasmus* observes, *that Christ is not called a Sinner here*, (as Dr. *Crisp* would have it,) *but Sin*; that is, *a Sacrifice for sin*, according to the Scripture sense: And *we are made the Righteousness of God in him*; that is, That God, upon the account of his Sacrifice and our Reconciliation to him, would treat us as righteous persons, or receive us into his grace and favour: Which is all that I can find, that *St. Paul* understood by this expression. I am now to shew,

SECT. IV.

[2.] THAT this notion of the *Change of Persons*, which Dr. *Crisp* asserts, is contrary to the whole Tenor of the Scripture, and the Terms of Salvation contained in the Gospel. I am sensible, how large a Field I am entered upon; and if I should pursue this matter as it deserves, it would take up much more room than I can allow to this Answer. I could easily prove, that in all the Transactions between God and Mankind, *some Conditions on our side* were required in order to his Favour. So it was in the State of Innocency: So it continued after man's Fall, as appears by those remarkable words of God to *Cain*; *If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted?*

SECT. IV.

ed? and if thou doeſt not well, Sin lieth at the door. Gen. iv. 7. So it was in God's dealing with the *Patriarchs*, and the moſt excellent Perſons in the Old Teſtament, *Abraham, Moſes, David, Job*, &c. But I paſs over theſe, (altho' I ſuppoſe they will not be denied to have been of the *Elect*, and to have had the Benefit of *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs* as well as Chriſtians,) and come to the Terms of Salvation, as declared by Chriſt himſelf. Let any one ſeriouſly peruſe the Doctrine which he preached, *from the time when he began to preach, and to ſay, Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand*; (Mat. iv. 17.) and he ſhall find, the main buſineſs of his preaching was, to put men upon performing ſuch *Conditions*, as were neceſſary to their Salvation; and for that very Reaſon: As may be ſeen in his Sermon on the Mount, in which he begins with promiſing *Bleſſedneſs* to the *humble, merciful, pure in heart*, &c. Mat. v. 3, 4. & *ſeq.* What do theſe things mean, if they be not *Conditions on our parts* neceſſary in order to Happineſs? and that they are conſidered by God as ſuch? Why doth he ſay, *ver.* 20. *Except your Righteouſneſs exceed the Righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees, ye ſhall in no caſe enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*; if ſuch a Righteouſneſs be not a *Condition* required in order to ſuch entrance? And if it be, no *Change of Perſons* without inward

ward and real Righteouſneſs can be ſufficient. Our Saviour doth not ſpeak of what will be *eventually* in ſome perſons, but of what is required to be done in order to an End. And therefore he concludes his Sermon with ſaying, *Whoſoever heareth theſe ſayings of mine, and doth them, I will liken him to a wiſe man, who built his Houſe upon a Rock, &c.* Mat. vii. 24. Not, he that believes that he is one of thoſe, who is made *compleatly righteous by a Change of Perſons*, without any Change of temper or diſpoſition of mind: He never promiſes the leaſt degree of happineſs to ſuch; but ſtill inſiſts on our own Endeavours, by *ſtriving to enter in at the ſtrait Gate*; which St. Paul calls, *working out our own Salvation with fear and trembling*; and St. Peter, *giving all diligence to make our Calling and Election ſure*; *for*, ſaith he, *if ye do theſe things, ye ſhall never fall.* SECT. IV.

Do not theſe expreſſions note the *neceſſity* of the performance of *Conditions* on our ſide? And therefore all imaginary notions of ſuch a *Change of Perſons*, as hath no regard to any Acts of ours, is wholly repugnant to the main Scope and Deſign of the Goſpel. I meddle not with the diſpute about the *Moral Law*, which muſt continue to oblige us as long as the Reaſon of it continues; but the main Argument to me is from the Goſpel, as it is delivered by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, who

SECT. IV. certainly understood *the Substance and Design of it* far better than Dr. *Crisp*, or the *Reporter* doth. What was transacted between the Father and the Son, we know no more than they have revealed to us; and we know they had no Design to impose upon mankind, by laying so much weight upon such *Conditions* as God had no regard to, and by concealing from them such a *Change of Persons* as made them *compleatly righteous* without any Act of theirs. If this were the case, men could never be reconciled to the just Veneration and Esteem we have of the Sacred Penmen of the Scriptures, nor to their Knowledge of the Mysteries of the Gospel, nor to their Fidelity in declaring them for the good of mankind. So that if we find nothing of this *Change of Persons* in their Writings, and so much as is utterly inconsistent with it, we have all the Reason in the world to reject it. I add,

[3]. THAT this notion of the *Change of Persons* is attended with very bad Consequences: Which I do not charge on those who do not see them, or are carried by some higher Principles above them. But we are not to judge of Persons but of Things, and the natural Tendency of Principles. And so the *Change of Persons* in this Sense hath these very bad Consequences: That it is apt to lessen our Reverence of the Divine Perfections; our just Sense

of

of the Differences of Good and Evil, and of our Obligations to all ſorts of Duties; that it tends to the Diſparagement of that *Free Grace* they pretend to exalt; and expoſes the Goſpel to the Reproach and Contempt of Infidels, and leaves the Minds of thoſe who embrace it, under great Temptations to *Preſumption*. SECT. IV.

Theſe things I can only mention, becauſe you deſired a ſhort Anſwer to your Queſtions, and I have brought it into as narrow a compaſs as I could. I am,

SIR,

Your Faithful Friend

Nov. 10, 1697. *and Servant,*

ED. WIGORN.

SECT. IV.

The Learned Dr. Edwards's *Anſwer to the ſame Three Queſtions, in a* Letter *to Mr.* Williams; *occaſioned by Mr.* Lobb's Remarks, *wherein he pretends, that the Doctor's* Preſervative againſt Socinianiſm *condemns Mr.* Williams's *Judgment concerning a* Change of Perſons.

SIR,

I HAVE peruſed the Paſſages which you refer to, (viz. *Goſpel-Truth ſtated*, pag. 41, 44. the places objected among the reſt,) beſides ſeveral other parts of your Books; though I have not as yet had Leiſure ſufficient to read them over: However I have read enough to know your Opinion, and to underſtand how you ſtate the Matter in debate between you and your *Antinomian* Adverſaries; and thereby am ſufficiently inſtructed to anſwer your Queries.

To the *Firſt* therefore I ſay, That when ſpeaking of the Sufferings of our Saviour, I aſſert, as other Divines uſually do, a Permutation of Perſons; *I mean no more than what you affirm; viz.* That Chriſt not only died for the good, but likewiſe

likewiſe *vice*, or *loco peccatorum*, in the room and place of Sinners. But when we aſſert an *Exchange*, or *Permutation of Perſons*, this muſt always be underſtood under ſuch reſtrictions and limitations, as may help us to avoid thoſe two dangerous Errors, which the *Antinomians* have fallen into. And therefore, SECT. IV.

(1.) WE muſt affirm, we mean no more thereby than *an obligation to Puniſhment*, which he no otherwiſe contracted than by his own free and voluntary conſent and undertaking, to undergo that Puniſhment which the Law threatned, and our Sins deſerved, *viz.* Death. But this muſt by no means be ſo far miſconſtrued, as to imagine that thereby *the filth* and *turpitude* of our Sins were transferred upon him. For tho' in the former Senſe, he is ſaid to be *made Sin for us*; yet in the latter, he ſtill continued *holy, harmleſs, undefiled, ſeparate from Sinners*, and at an eternal diſtance from them. Neither,

(2.) MUST this *Permutation* be extended ſo far as to imply a reciprocal *Exchange of Perſons, viz.* of us Sinners, into the room and place of Chriſt: As if God did look upon us, as doing all that Chriſt did; and conſequently, that we do merit Pardon, atone Juſtice, compleatly ſatisfy and fulfill the Law, ſo that we are actually diſcharged from Puniſhment without more ado. No, we continue ſtill under the

SECT. IV. Sentence of the Law, notwithſtanding all that Chriſt did to free us from it, till we perform thoſe *Conditions* upon which the application of Pardon is ſuſpended. The immediate effect therefore and conſequence of the *Permutation* which we are ſpeaking of, is only this; that Chriſt by dying *in our room*, had ſo far reconciled us to his Father, as that he is willing to pardon and admit us to his favour, provided that we on our parts perform the *Conditions* of the New Covenant, *viz.* Repentance and Faith. For tho' Chriſt by dying for us hath merited our Pardon, yet it ſtill continues ſo far in his own Power, as that he will not diſpoſe of it, but upon ſuch Terms as have been agreed upon between him and his Father; which indeed are no other than ſuch, as without which we are neither capable of Pardon, nor can God in Honour beſtow it upon us. To apply Pardon to a Sinner while he continues in his obſtinacy and impenitence, is not only contrary to the Holineſs of God, but inconſiſtent with his Wiſdom, and deſtructive of his Authority and Government. And therefore the Graces before mentioned muſt be looked upon by us, to be both *the neceſſary Parts* of every Chriſtian's Duty, and *the indiſpenſable Conditions* of his Happineſs. [In another *Letter*,] I intend no more by an *Exchange of Perſons*, than what you have affirmed in your Writings.

As

As to your *Second* Query, I judge those Aſſertions and Acknowledgments frequently made by you in your Books concerning the *Sufferings of Chriſt*, and the *Satisfaction* thereby made to the Juſtice of God for the Sins of men, do fully acquit you from giving any countenance to the Errors of *Socinus* in that point. [In another *Letter*,] You have very rightly, and in an Orthodox manner, ſtated the Doctrine of *Chriſt's Satisfaction*; and it is in perfect agreement with the Doctrine of our own and all the reformed Churches, and therefore fully acquits you from the Imputation of *Socinianiſm*. SECT. IV.

As to the *Third* Query, with relation to the Doctrine of Dr. *Criſp* and others of that Sect, who affirm *ſuch a Permutation of Perſons* between Chriſt and Sinners, as if to all intents and purpoſes they were to be looked upon in the room and place of each other; ſo that *Chriſt* is to be accounted *the Swearer, Drunkard, Blaſphemer* on one hand, and the *Sinner* to be *perfectly righteous* on the other; I cannot but look upon it to be, not only falſe, abſurd, impoſſible, but likewiſe an impious and blaſphemous Opinion; as being highly diſhonourable to our Saviour, repugnant to the Wiſdom and Juſtice of God, and tends plainly to ſubvert the whole deſign of Chriſtianity; which is hereby expoſed to the juſt and unanſwerable Reproaches of its

SECT. IV. its Adversaries, which can never be wiped off, if the Opinion be true.

I WOULD say a great deal more upon this occasion, if it were necessary; but what I have thus briefly suggested, may I suppose be sufficient for your present purpose. And if you think that what I have wrote may be any way serviceable to the common cause of our holy Religion, I give you leave to make what use you think fit of it; and in the mean time remain,

Sir,

Jesus Coll. Oxon. Oct. 28. 97. *Your assured Servant,*

Jonathan Edwards.

I HAD not given this trouble to these Great Men; but that Mr. *Lobb* makes frequent use of their Testimony against my Judgment, in favour of them whom I oppose. And being no Authors better understand, and more effectually oppose *Socinianism*, I was sure their Vindication of me would be past exception; and therefore made bold to propose to them, *First*, Whether they intended more by a *Commutation of Persons*, than I did affirm in my Books? (which I sent them.) *Secondly*, Whether I was by the Passages excepted against in my Book (by the *First Paper* and Mr. *Lobb*,) chargeable with *Socinianism*?

nianiſm? And, *Thirdly*, What their Judgment was concerning that *Change of Perſons* which I oppoſe, and Dr. *Criſp* and others of that Sect affirm? To theſe Queſtions they were pleaſed to ſend theſe Anſwers, with a Permiſſion to print them. SECT. IV.

I THINK, every man will conclude from what they ſay, that they account our holy Religion is ſtruck at by what Errors I oppoſe; and that Mr. *Lobb* doth wreſt their Books, when he cites them in Confutation of what I affirm.

I MIGHT have added *another Letter* of this Right Reverend *Biſhop* to the ſame effect; and wherein he proves, that God was *not diſpleaſed with Chriſt:* And alſo of the ſaid Reverend Dr. *Edwards*. But theſe publiſhed abundantly ſuffice.

SECT. V.

Some Animadverſions on Mr. Lobb's Defence of the Report. *By* D. Williams. *Note, I call the Author of the* Rebuke, *Mr.* R.

THOUGH I have the Teſtimony of the Miniſters and Elders of all the Diſſenting Congregations in *Dublin* (except

SECT. V. cept one,) for my Peaceableneſs and Diligence in the promoting of Union there; yet being induſtriouſly branded as the great Divider in this place, it's neceſſary to repreſent the Cauſe of men's miſtakes.

To me is aſcribed the Riſe of our Diviſions, becauſe at the requeſt of ſeveral Miniſters, after other means were unſucceſsful, I wrote *Goſpel-Truth ſtated*; when Dr. *Criſp*'s re-printed Book ſo obtained as to threaten our Miniſtry. The Continuance of our Breaches I am charged with, on no better pretence than this; a beaten man makes all that Noiſe, which proceeds from the furious Blows that fall upon his perſon. I conſented to that Expedient in 1692. wherein all objected againſt my Book was adjuſted; and gave no cauſe for the Objectors to violate that Agreement.

Mr. *Chauncy*, Mr. *Trayl*, Mr. *Keach*, Mr. *Edwards*, *&c.* wrote Volumes againſt that Book; to all which I replied in a *Defence* of Six Sheets; thinking that ſufficient, and in hopes ſome Reſt might be obtained by ſilence. Mr. *Mather* revives the aſſault with a Charge of *Blaſphemy* and *damning Errors*: This extorted a ſhort *Reply* at the end of *Man made righteous*;

THEN by Contrivances I was voted out of the Lecture at *Pinners-Hall*: Whereupon Dr. *Bates*, Mr. *Howe*, Mr. *Aſſop*, and my ſelf, remove to *Salters-Hall*. About two months after this, my Morals (upon

(upon a ſearch back to my Childhood) are impeached: The *united Miniſters* unanimouſly adjudged and declared me clear and innocent of all that was laid to my Charge. I forbear Recriminations againſt many, for which I am furniſhed. SECT. V.

THE ſame Book comes again upon the Stage with Mr. *Lobb*'s Objections; which I anſwered in one Sheet. Mr. *Lobb* rejoineth; but at the Reverend Dr. *Bates*'s requeſt, I laid aſide a Book ready for the Preſs. The Doctor and I fully agree in Senſe, notwithſtanding he had uſed ſome Phraſes which Mr. *Lobb* hoped to divide us by.

THEY ſtop not here: As the reſult of many private meetings with my Adverſaries, a Paper is gotten ſubſcribed (when I was at *Bath*,) by ſome at leaſt of my Friends, who fully agreed with me in Doctrine. Herein there were ſeveral miſtakes in matters of Fact, referring to the Subſcription to my Book; many inſinuated reflections (not deſigned by all,) againſt the Doctrine of that Book; with ſuch ambiguities and omiſſions, as endangered the Truths by me defended; and thoſe Terms propoſed to me, which might ſtartle a man they had no power over, and who juſtly expected better treatment, at leaſt from ſuch whoſe cauſe I pleaded. Yet when this Paper was laid aſide, and the *Third Paper* agreed to, I ſate ſtill; tho' I knew

SECT. V.

knew that *Firſt Paper* (unprinted) was ſent through the Nation to my great detriment.

MIGHT not one expect ſome Quiet, after ſuch various attempts againſt this Book and its Author? (which I do not aſcribe to the *Congregational*, as a Body; nor had I mentioned moſt of theſe things, if I were not charged with all our Diviſions.) My hopes are diſappointed; Mr. *Lobb* printeth his *Report*, wherein the *united Miniſters* for my ſake are branded for *Socinians*, and therein inſerts that unhappy Paper. Nay, he ſoon follows this with his *Remarks*, to faſten his Charge the deeper upon me. Stops he here? No, in this his *Defence* I am ſtill pelted, my Doctrine groſsly arraigned, and the learned Mr. *R.* cenſured as a *Socinian* for defending me. My Book ſuſtains the Clamour, becauſe it denies the *Criſpian Change of Perſon*: Nay, he hopes it hath ſome inviſible evil thing within its Bowels, which if I do not bring forth, (for no body elſe can,) I muſt be one *offenſive* and *halting*, *pag.* 88. Nay, as if firſt in his intention, the laſt words in his Book are, *Whether Mr.* Williams *be ſincere or no, he muſt now ſhew it. FINIS.* The *Engliſh* of this is, if I be *ſincere* I muſt ſhew my ſelf *erroneous*, that they may have ſomewhat to juſtify their paſt Clamours; for as yet they can prove nothing: And yet, (will you not wonder?) he gives me (*pag.* 9.)

more

more hopes of *their Charity* and *Communion*, if I will but write Errors plainly, than they can now allow me when I aſſert the oppoſite Truths. SECT. V.

AM not I in a ſtreight? He and others call and provoke me to write; (and they might do it long enough, if the Intereſt of the Goſpel, and ſuch Injuries to my Friend aſſiſted not their Calls:) Yet if I write, I ſhall be deem'd the Cauſe of all our Diviſions. But ſo 'twill be, if I write not; nay, if I be not *felo de ſe*. I ſhall therefore adventure, ſo preſſed by Mr. *Lobb*, to give him ſome haſty thoughts. I may well call it an *adventure*, for I foreſee, unleſs he is much changed ſince he wrote this *Defence*, he will miſ-repreſent what is written with the greateſt caution; and if his Readers ſhall think him a fair Adverſary, he is ſure to have the better of any man, as will ſoon appear.

Mr. *Lobb* ſays, *pag.* 35. "The Phraſe "of *a Change of Chriſt's Perſon* was ne-"ver invented, till the Gentleman, who "engaged my Brother to enter upon this "ſorrowful undertaking, ſtarted it. And to "ſpeak the truth, it's a Phraſe only ad-"juſted to expreſs no more, than what "the *Socinians* do conſtantly grant; for "they ſay, that Chriſt, tho' he ſuffered "not the Puniſhment due to us for ſin, "yet he endured grievous and dolorous "Pains; which is aptly enough expreſſed,

"when

SECT. V. " when it is ſaid, there was *a Change of* " *Chriſt's Perſon for us*, for he was, ſay " theſe Hereticks, *changed from eaſe to* " *pain for our good.*"

NOTE, (1.) The Phraſe, *Change of Perſon*, was uſed by Dr. *Criſp*, and therefore not invented by me, (whom he meaneth;) it is from him I cited it. (2.) Is it ſo ill a Phraſe, and ſerves only a *Socinian* purpoſe? then Mr. *Lobb* ſhould not make me a *Socinian*, only for denying this Phraſe. He ſaith, (and that, when he will ſpeak the truth,) it's *adjuſted only to expreſs* what the *Socinians* conſtantly grant; and yet quarrels with me for denying this dangerous expreſſion. (3.) If this bad Phraſe, *Change of Perſon*, and that good Phraſe, *Change of Perſons*, differ ſo far as Heterodox and Orthodox; did not Mr. *Lobb* deal unfairly all this while, in telling the world I denied that *good* Phraſe *Change of Perſons*, only becauſe I denied this *bad* Phraſe *Change of Perſon*? For I aſſure you, I no where deny *a Change of Perſons* in the Plural number, (tho' according to his liberty he ſaith I did, *pag.* 42.) and I fully aſſert the ſound Senſe of it, as *the Right Reverend the Biſhop of* Worceſter, *and the Reverend Dr.* Edwards *do witneſs*; and they are men he makes great uſe of in his Book, as very ſound in this point. But being more concerned for my Friend, Mr. *Rebuker*, I ſhall with this place begin an Account of

of ſome of the ſtabbing Injuries he receives from Mr. *Lobb*, with an *Art thou in health, my Brother?* SECT. V.

[1.] Mr. *Lobb* makes Mr. *R.* here to ſay (with the *Socinians*,) that there was *a Change* only *in the Perſon of Chriſt*, without an *exchange* at all with Sinners. Becauſe Mr. *R.* ſaith, there was *a Change of the Perſon of Chriſt*, in exchange for the Perſons of Sinners, (tho' not reciprocally, in all reſpects;) this is plain; for a mere Change from Eaſe to Pain is only a Change *in Chriſt's Perſon*. Mr. *Lobb* ſaith, *pag.* 31. "My Brother is in good earneſt, "only for *a Change of Chriſt's Perſon*, "without *a Change of Perſons* between "Chriſt and us:" When it was thus expreſſed in the *Rebuke*, *pag.* 44. ['This 'Phraſe, *the Change of the Perſon of* 'Chriſt, hath truly an honeſt ſound Senſe, 'viz. the *Subſtitution* of one Perſon *in* 'the room of another; and a proper Re'demption may be obtained by the Pu'niſhment of one in the room of ano'ther: — If therefore Chriſt's dying, *by* 'way of Change or Exchange, be all they 'would have, it's granted, *&c.*'] Yet from this very place Mr. *Lobb* infers, as above.

[2.] Mr. *Lobb* repreſents Mr. *R.* to hold with the *Socinians*, that Chriſt ſuffered *only ſo for our good*, as not to ſuffer truly *in our ſtead*. Becauſe Mr. *R.* affirmed,

SECT. V.

that Chriſt's ſuffering *properly in our ſtead* was *for our good*; Mr. *Lobb* ſaith, *pag.* 47. "Whatever my Brother intends, it's "manifeſt, that while he calls the *Soci-* "*nian* Senſe of Chriſt's *ſuffering in our* "*ſtead*, knaviſh; he gives the very Senſe "of this Phraſe, which the *Socinians* who "uſe it do give; and by it means (if we "may judge his meaning by his words,) "no more than what *Socinus*, *Crellius*, "and that *Fraternity*, do conſiſtently with "their denial of Chriſt's Satisfaction con-"ſtantly grant." He ſaith worſe in the lines before: (See alſo *pag.* 36. and ſeveral times elſewhere.) The Place he grounds this upon is, *Reb. pag.* 35. where it is ſaid, ['The Caviller proceeds; *In our* 'place and *ſtead* (with ſome) ſignify no 'more, than *for our good*: Why, it's 'impoſſible they ſhould: That which 'Chriſt ſuffered *in our ſtead* was *for our* 'good; to bear the Puniſhment of our ſins 'to ſatisfy Divine Juſtice, was certainly '*for our good*, &c. Therefore *for our* 'good, becauſe *in our ſtead*.']

READER, Is not Chriſt's bearing the Puniſhent of our ſins to ſatisfy Divine Juſtice, *ſuffering properly in our ſtead?* And is ſuffering properly in our ſtead, and ſuffering *in our ſtead* in the *Socinian* Senſe, (*viz.* improperly, and not at all,) the ſame thing? But Mr. *R.* ſaid, ['It's impoſſible, 'in *our ſtead* ſhould ſignify any more, than

'for

for our good.] I answer, That it is, considered with respect to our concernment therein, as it is a benefit designed for us; but not to exclude its being *in our place and stead*, which he fully asserts, and without which we had been ruined for ever. Is not *man's chief end*, to be happy in the enjoyment of God? and doth not Christ's dying *properly in our stead* subserve that end? Mr. *Lobb* might better say, Mr. *R.* denied that Christ's dying in our stead was *for God's glory*, to which *our good* is subordinate; than that he denied that Christ died *properly in our stead*, because as to our own felicity it did no more than subserve it. Or was it *for our hurt?* or could it be more beneficial to us, than *for our good?* for it is only as to our benefit he applies the words. SECT. V.

[3.] Mr. *Lobb* represents Mr. *R.* to deny (with the *Socinians*,) that Christ's Sufferings are *a proper Punishment* for our Sins: When Mr. *R.* doth most expressly assert, that Christ's Sufferings were the Punishment of our Sins, for Satisfaction to the vindictive Justice of God. Thus he is charged by Mr. *Lobb*, *pag.* 48. "Agreeably hereto, [the *Socinians* foisting in a "wretched Sense, and rejecting of Phrases "to make Christ's Sufferings *not penal*,] "my Brother, as he rejects the Phrases of "Christ's *sustaining the Person of Sinners*, "&c. and puts an unsound Sense on "Christ's

SECT. V. " Chriſt's *ſuffering in our place and ſtead*; " ſo that word [*anſwering for them the* " *obligations of the violated Law,*] which " was in the *Firſt Paper*, to make it evident " that we eſteemed Chriſt's Sufferings to be " a proper Puniſhment, is rejected, as what " cannot in my Brother's opinion bear a " ſound Senſe." This Charge, that Mr. *R.* denies Chriſt's Sufferings to be Puniſhments, he impoſeth in very many Pages. Whereas Mr. *R.* ſaith, *pag.* 35. ' Chriſt did bear the *Puniſhment of our* ' *ſins* to ſatisfy *Divine Juſtice*:' And *pag.* 48. ' It is freely granted, that Chriſt ' ſuffered and died *for the Perſons* of Sinners, and *for the Sins* of their Perſons, ' and *in the room and ſtead* of their Perſons; and that he ſuffered and died *to* ' *make Satisfaction to the Juſtice*, to the ' *vindictive Juſtice of God*, &c.'

WHAT pretends Mr. *Lobb* againſt ſo full conviction? No other, than that we by the *Third* Paper *rejected* this Phraſe, *obligations of the violated Law.* But this is not true; we only *waved it*, and Mr. *R.* ſaith no more. But Mr. *Lobb* ſaith, *pag.* 50. " The Phraſe which we put in " its ſtead, [*Chriſt came to anſwer for our* " *violation of the Law of works,*] differs as " much from their Phraſe, [*anſwering for* " *us the obligations of the violated Law of* " *works,*] as a *Goſpel Truth*, and a *Soci-* " *nian Error.*" One would think, it is ſtill

ſtill a true Phraſe after his mangling it. But pray take it as in our Paper: "Chriſt "came into *our room and ſtead* to anſwer "for our violation of the Law of works;" to which add what follows, "And the "*Puniſhment of our ſins* was inflicted on "Chriſt, that God might, without injury "to his Juſtice, pardon and ſave peni-"tent Believers." Is this a *Socinian Error?* Or, is a word wanting to make Chriſt's Sufferings *proper Puniſhments?* Nay, what is it for Chriſt *in our ſtead* to anſwer for our violations? But go yet lower: Is not *to anſwer for our Sins*, another thing than *Socinians* hold? even this is no leſs, than *ſuffering the Puniſhment of our ſins*, if we were for violating the Law, *under its obligations* to ſuffer thoſe Puniſhments. But I come to Mr. *Lobb*'s Charge againſt Mr. *R.* from the words, *cannot bear a ſound Senſe.* SECT. V.

[4.] BECAUSE Mr. *R.* uſed certain warm words once, and that only againſt the *unſound Senſe* of that *ſingle* Phraſe, *Commutation of Perſons*, (which yet, he there ſaith, may be capable of receiving a ſound meaning;) Mr. *Lobb* makes Mr. *R.* to intend thoſe warm words, againſt the *ſound Senſe* of that Phraſe, againſt that Phraſe it ſelf, and a great many other good Phraſes which himſelf makes uſe of as very ſafe; yea, againſt the ſound Senſe of many other Phraſes which Mr. *R.* pleads for. I

SECT. V. ſhall fully recite the only place upon which Mr. *Lobb* grounds his charge; *Reb. pag.* 30. [' A *Change of Perſons between* ' *Chriſt and us*, which may poſſibly be ' capable of receiving *a ſound meaning*, ' (elſewhere explained,) and yet is more ' ſounding towards a dangerous Senſe; the ' Brethren did unanimouſly agree to grant ' as much as the *ſound Senſe* could bear, ' and modeſtly to wave and paſs by *the* ' *other*, *which was liable* to be interpreted ' to a Senſe and Sound of malignity to the ' whole of the Goſpel.'] You ſee *the other* which could not bear a ſound Senſe, but *was liable* to a Sound of malignity, is but one thing; for *other* is not *nomen multitudinis*, and agrees with the Verb [*was*] which is in the ſingular Number. This *other*, to which theſe words are appropriated, cannot be the Phraſe, *Commutation of Perſons*, for that is not waved, but retained by us in the *Third Paper*; nor can it be the *ſound Senſe* of that Phraſe, for that's provided for by Mr. *R.*; much leſs can it be *all the Phraſes* and Paſſages in the *Firſt Paper* omitted in the *Third*. It muſt then be confined to ſome *one thing*, expreſſive of the *unſound Senſe*, which the *Criſpians* put upon the Phraſe, *Change of Perſons*; which Mr. *R*'s. following words point at: [' And the Brethren are now ' more fully perſuaded, that they were in ' the right, by the *Reporter*'s Notions:'] And

And what's that? Such a *Change*, as makes *Chriſt* to be *deſtitute of a Righteouſneſs entitling to eternal Life*, and to *become Sin as we are Sin*; (*Report*, *pag.* 5, 7.) that is, filthy Sinners. SECT. V.

YET upon this foreſaid Paſſage of Mr. *R.* Mr. *Lobb* ſays, *pag.* 14. "This Paſſage of my Reverend Brother doth "make it manifeſt, that the Paragraphs, "Terms, and Phraſes, which were in the "*Firſt Paper*, and were waved and paſſed "by in the compoſure of the *Third*, are "looked upon by my Brother, as what "*could not bear a ſound Senſe*, but were "liable to be interpreted to *a Senſe and* "*Sound of malignity* to the whole of the "Goſpel: That is to ſay, the Phraſe of "Chriſt's *putting on the Perſon of Sinners*, "of his *anſwering for us the obligations of* "*the violated Law of works*, the Term "*Surety*, and the Aſſertion of the *neceſſity* "*of a Commutation of Perſons*, cannot bear "a ſound Senſe, but are liable, *&c.* This "is the Senſe of my Reverend Brother." And ſo theſe words, *cannot bear a ſound Senſe*, &c. are trumped up I believe forty times with theſe by tale, from *pag.* 48, to 65. Nay, in this laſt, *pag.* 65. he ſaith, "According to what my Brother declares, "it muſt be ſuppoſed, that this Paſſage "in the *Firſt Paper*, [*viz.* Regeneration, "Repentance towards God, Faith in our "Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and a holy Converſation,

SECT. V. " are by God's word manifeſtly neceſſary " to the Salvation of a Sinner;] *cannot* " *bear a ſound Senſe, but is liable to be in-* " *terpreted to a Senſe and Sound of malig-* " *nity.*" Muſt not Mr. *R.* tho' thus loudly warned, find it impoſſible to guard himſelf againſt this man?

[5.] Mr. *R. pag.* 17. ſaith, ['These 'Phraſes, terms, or expreſſions, of a '*Change of Perſons between Chriſt and us*, 'and his *taking on him the Perſon of Sin-* '*ners*, are unknown to our *Confeſſions*, and 'not to be found in the Body of Confeſ-'ſions.'] Mr. *Lobb* expoſeth him by citing *a Confeſſion*, that uſeth ſome Phraſes Mr. *R.* makes uſe of, and others which he never denied; but mentions *no Confeſſion* that hath the Phraſes Mr. *R.* ſaid, could not be found. Upon this poor work he toils from *pag.* 71, to 80. I muſt ſtay a little on what occurs *pag.* 73. and aſk,

(1.) WHEN Mr. *R.* denied only, that *theſe Phraſes* (not the ſound Senſe) were in the *Confeſſions*; why ſhould Mr. *Lobb* make him deny, that the *Confeſſions gave any countenance* to the *ſound Senſe* of thoſe Phraſes?

(2.) WHEN Mr. *Lobb* declares he had been *ſilent*, if he had not *found theſe Phraſes in ſome Confeſſions*, and ridicules Mr. *R.* for denying they were in them; why did not he ſhew *theſe Phraſes*, or one of

of them, in ſome or other *Confeſſion?* SECT. V.

(3.) IF *theſe Phraſes*, as to the Letters and Syllables, (which M. *R.* called for,) are wherever the *ſound Senſe* of them is to be found, (which is what Mr. *Lobb* pretends, or fondly argues;) why doth he deny, that the very Phraſes of *Chriſt taking on him the Perſon of Sinners*, &c. are in the *Third Paper*, and ſay they are rejected by us, ſeeing the *ſound Senſe* of thoſe very Phraſes is there?

(4.) Mr. *Lobb* ſaith, "The Phraſes of "a *Change of Perſons*, of *Chriſt's ſuſtaining our Perſon*, of his *being ſubſtituted* "*into our room*, and his *ſuffering in our* "*place and ſtead*, are ſo nearly allied, that "they live and die together; grant one, "and all neceſſarily come in with it; *&c.*" They muſt then be of the ſame adequate Senſe with each other, or the *Confeſſion* could not aſſert *Chriſt's ſuſtaining our Perſon*, by its ſaying, *Chriſt died in our ſtead*: But if the Senſe be adequate, then Mr. *R.* denies the right Senſe of none of theſe Phraſes; for he aſſerts, *Chriſt died properly in our place and ſtead*, and that *he was ſubſtituted in our room.* Whence it will be no better by Mr. *Lobb*'s own confeſſion, than that he makes all this Noiſe to ſhew his *Copia verborum:* He will have the mentioning of each of the various words of the ſame ſignification, to be Terms of Communion, and the omiſſion of any one

as

SECT. V.

as great a bar to it, as if the very Senſe of all thoſe words were denied; ay, and that when the full juſt Senſe of any of thoſe words is granted.

FOR my part, after all his big words, from *pag.* 58, to 65. about *Logical Terms*, or *mere human Forms of Speech*, (tho' I believe, they who drew up the *Third Paper* never dreamt of ſuch deſigns, as he with ſomewhat too like *malice* faſtens on them,) I would think him a turbulent, uncharitable Schiſmatick, who would divide from others, merely becauſe they ſcrupled this or that *human form of words*, ſo they held and plainly expreſſed the Scriptural Truth deſigned by thoſe words, yea, tho' they expreſſed it by Terms leſs proper. How much more culpable is it then, to raiſe ſuch Storms, only for our omitting a Phraſe, becauſe leſs intelligible to the People, more capable of being abuſed by the Etymology and Acceptation thereof among the Vulgar, and known to be groſsly abuſed by the *Criſpians* from that occaſion? May not Mr. *Lobb* commence as juſt a War, if people ſhould omit his fine Phraſe, *Zeal for Populacy*, and yet be willing to uſe their plain Phraſe, *Zeal for Popularity?*

BUT to conclude this head: I deny, that his *Change of Perſons*, or *Chriſt's ſuffering in our Perſon*, either in the *Criſpian* Senſe, or his own, as ſtated in the *Report*, *pag.* 5. are included in, or to be proved from,

from, the *Confeſſions*. To pretend the *literal Phraſes*, from ſuch words, as *Chriſt died in our ſtead*, and was *ſubſtituted in our room*, is ſordid; and the Confeſſors meaning in thoſe words, is contrary to the *Criſpian* and the *Reporter*'s Senſe: And therefore Mr. *Lobb*'s Phraſes are not at all proved from the *Confeſſions*; unleſs a thing be proved, where the Phraſe is unmentioned, and the Senſe oppoſed. SECT. V.

[6.] Mr. *Lobb*, that he might bring his *Engliſh* Reader to judge Mr. *R.* a baffled man, leaves out a conſiderable word in his tranſlating a part of the *Scotch Confeſſion*; which he thus renders, *pag.* 81. "It became the Redeemer to be true God "and true Man, becauſe he was to ſuffer "the Puniſhments due for our ſins, and "to appear [*quaſi in perſonâ noſtrâ coram "judicio Patris, pro noſtrâ tranſgreſſione "& inobedientiâ pati,*] in our Perſon before "the Judgment-Seat of the Father, to "ſuffer for our Tranſgreſſions and Diſobedience." Thus Mr. *Lobb Engliſheth* the *Latin* words, and boaſts, "*Here you ſee "the Church of* Scotland *uſeth this very "Phraſe*, &c." But leſt his admirers ſhould applaud his conqueſt to an indecency, it's fit they know, there's a word [*quaſi*,] which Mr. *Lobb* did not think for his purpoſe to *Engliſh*. He ought to have ſaid thus; "and to appear [*as it were*] in "our Perſon;" that is, Chriſt appeared not

SECT. V.

not properly in our Perſon; but that Phraſe is too hard, tho' there be ſomewhat towards it, in ſome certain reſpect; as *Calvin* in this caſe uſeth *quodammodo*. But Mr. *Lobb*, by leaving out *quaſi*, performs what he undertook, *pag.* 73. "*Perhaps* "*it may appear*, [that is, to the *Engliſh-* "*man*,] that the Phraſe moſt expoſed by "him will be found *literally* in one or o- "ther *Confeſſion*." Theſe words cited are all, by which he makes it to *appear*; and *quaſi* anſwers to *perhaps*. Nay, had the diminutive *quaſi* been out, he is not ſure it had ſerved his turn.

BUT conſidering the wonted Freedom of the man, I wonder he left not out this *quaſi*. For I could give many Inſtances, where the very next words omitted by him, would have defeated his purpoſe by what he citeth. But, to prevent a ſnare, I'll prefer that in his *Letter to Dr. Bates*, *pag.* 17. where he ſaith, "Many "hold Chriſt and us to be *one Perſon in* "*Law*: And, that it may be ſaid, that "*we ſuffered in Chriſt*, is the import of "that aſſertion which ſaith, that Chriſt "ſuffered as our Surety; and is allowed "by Mr. *Baxter*:" Juſt againſt this, Mr. *Lobb* cites in the Margin, "*It is not ſo* "*aptly ſaid*, he ſatisfied, *as that* he ſuffer- "ed *in the Perſon of Sinners*: *Mr.* Bax- "ter, *Cath. Theol. part.* ii. *pag.* 79." (It ſhould be, *pag.* 76, 77.) Amazed I took

Mr.

Mr. *Baxter*'s Book, and found the very next words were; ' *Note*, That it is not ' any *other* man's Perſon that Chriſt ſuffer- ' ed in, but *his own*; and we *mean*, that ' he took upon him the Perſon of a Sinner ' himſelf, in as much as he conſented to ' ſuffer for ſin: And ſo *perſonating* here, ' is *not* becoming any other man's perſon in ' a *Law-ſenſe*, *ſo as that other legally ſuf- ' fered what he did*; but it is *only* his own ' Perſon's becoming a Sufferer in the ſtead ' of Sinners for their ſins.' And two or three lines before, Mr. *Baxter* tells us, ' *To ſay*, that Chriſt ſatisfied in our Per- ' ſon, and we by him, *is falſe*, *and ſub- ' verts the Goſpel.*'

SECT. V.

OR why did not Mr. *Lobb ſplit* the word *quaſi*, and leave out the laſt ſyllable *ſi*; then *qua* being oft *reduplicative*, had better fitted. Thus he ſerved me, when in *Man made Righteous*, *pag.* 122. I had ſaid, " Therefore Chriſt *HEREIN* is what the " *Civilians* call an *Expromiſſor*; he is " *obliged alone*, tho' he acts for another." Mr. *Lobb* in his *Letter to Dr. Bates*, *pag.* 12, 13. to expoſe me as unlearned, and himſelf ſkilful, recites *ſeveral properties* of an *Expromiſſor*, and will have me to mean that *all theſe* did belong to Chriſt; and then infers what pleaſed himſelf; whereas I had by the entire word *Herein*, limited it to *one property* of an *Ex promiſſor*, *viz.* *He is obliged alone*, tho' he acts for another,

SECT. V.

ther, (*viz.* in Redemption-work.) Mr. *Lobb* ſeeing the word *Herein* would mar his project, he fairly *ſplits* the word, leaving out *In*, and makes it (*a local*) *HERE*; and ſo found Scope for his purpoſe.

THESE few Inſtances of many, may convince, how unfit Mr. *Lobb* is to report other men's words; tho' his Talent ſeems confined to the collecting and publiſhing what Authors write: It were well for his Readers, he did it with more of true Judgment, and leſs of Trick; for thereby his Quotations would more edify, and require leſs care and pains to become ſure the Authors are not miſ-repreſented.

[7.] MEN will ſcarce judge it decent or prudent in Mr. *Lobb*, (if in his Friend,) to publiſh by that *Letter* to himſelf, a Reflection on the *Rebuker* for his Loyalty to the preſent Government, as inconſiſtent with a few Rhetorical expreſſions, in addreſſing the *late King James*, (to whom his obligations were ſomewhat peculiar.) But whereby doth *his meaning appear ſo inſincere* at that time? Or what is done by him ſince, *ſo contradictious to what he ſaid*, as to render him an *Exemplar of Inſincerity* now? No other, than ſwearing allegiance to King *William*, ſigning the Aſſociation, and carrying it as becomes a Loyal Subject in his Prayers, Sermons, and peaceable behaviour and advices? What Fetters are ſome in, if once addreſſing

SECT. V.

ſing the *late King* by a few big words, muſt eternally proclaim a man an Hypocrite, unleſs he be now a *Non-juror*, *Non-aſſociator*, *Plotter*, and Director of other Miniſters (in imitation of himſelf) to *pray ſo for the King*, as either of the two Kings may be intended, if they muſt at all ſeem to pray for King *William*. I hope, few will be gull'd into ſuch a Character, from the fancied obligations of former Addreſſes, (tho' ſome of them were highly inconſiderate,) nor any diſcouraged from a perſevering Loyalty by the forecited aſperſion. This would admit enlargement, which provocations might improve. But I retain a Reſpect ſufficient to forbid it; nor had I inſerted the leaſt hint at ſuch things, except as a warning againſt the like Inſtances, when his *firſt-rate man* is to execute his *fiery* threats, and his *very learned Perſon already roufed* (alike obnoxious) ſtretcheth forth his Claws. Let men take their way, but the common Intereſt will not long be ſacrificed, ere ſome (now impoſed on) will find out the Inſtruments and Deſigns of our Breaches. I hope, the Reverend *Rebuker* will pardon my Interpoſal, and that I acquainted him not therewith. His abilities for a Reply I acknowledge ſuch, that if theſe ſhort hints ſerve for a Foil to that he is preparing, and in the interim abate the ill Impreſſions of Mr. *Lobb*'s attempt, I ſhall account theſe few

SECT. V.

few hours well employed; which otherwiſe had been more feelingly ſpent in reſenting thoſe baſe Reflections, that I am *his Leader, Maſter, Principal*, and what elſe became ſcarce any man, beſides Mr. *Lobb* their Author.

Mr. *Lobb* owneth, *pag.* 8. "I granted, "that *beſides the effects made ours, the very* "*Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed* to Be- "lievers;" but adds, "*I mean nothing by* "*this Grant*;" becauſe I uſe a Simile to illuſtrate the manner, in *Man made Righteous, pag.* 89. 'If one give me my 'Liberty, which he voluntarily purchaſed 'for me at a dear rate, he *mediately* gives 'me what he paid for my Ranſom, tho' 'immediately I receive my Liberty and a 'Right thereto.'

Anſw. HAD he cited the *Apodoſis*, which is in the next words, he had ſpoiled his ſuggeſtion. I ſhall contract what I there enlarge on. I make Pardon and Adoption to be benefits, or *effects following* upon the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs. And the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt I diſtinguiſh into, (1.) His performance of the conditions of the Covenant of Redemption; and (2.) His Right (or *jus adjudicatum*) by the Covenant of Redemption, to our Pardon and Adoption, for his performance of the Conditions adjuſted in that Covenant. The former I ſaid, is *mediately imputed*. The latter I ſaid, is *immediately*

mediately imputed; it's reckoned to us when believers, becauſe it was acquired expreſsly for believers. *John* iii. 16. *Iſa.* liii. 10, 11. The judicial Imputation of *this Right of Chriſt intervening*, the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt (as a performance of the conditions) is imputed as our Plea for that Pardon; it being the procuring cauſe of that Right of Chriſt, which is *immediately* imputed to us. And *this Right* I alſo diſtinguiſh, from *that* which the Goſpel-promiſe made to believers doth inveſt them in: For the former Right reſults *immediately to Chriſt* from the Covenant of Redemption, and is ſubjectively in him, tho' imputed to us: Whereas the Promiſe, [he that believes ſhall be forgiven, or ſaved,] not only ſuppoſeth the former tranſactions, and is the Inſtrument by which God imputeth Chriſt's Righteouſneſs to the believer; but it alſo, as a conditional promiſe, giveth believers a Right to forgiveneſs, whereof they are the immediate Subjects. Here Mr. *Lobb* may ſee the vanity of his Objection: It is not Pardon, or ſuch poſſeſſed effects, that intermediate between Chriſt's Righteouſneſs and us, nor only the Right given by the Goſpel's conditional grant: No, it's *Chriſt's own Right*, and that imputed to us by God himſelf, and that *immediately* to us. And pray, is God's imputing to us Chriſt's performance of the conditions, ſo far as to

SECT. V.

SECT. V. be our plea and foundation of claim, no Imputation of his Righteouſneſs at all, becauſe the Imputation of Chriſt's acquired Right intervenes? Nothing is left out, but God's *legal accounting us to have performed* all that, by which Chriſt merited and made Atonement. Yet without this proud aſſumption, nothing will pleaſe Mr. *Lobb*.

BEING ſo often preſſed to it by Mr. *Humfrey* and Mr. *Lobb*, I will endeavour their ſatisfaction. If Chriſt had acquired by his Death a power indefinitely to forgive ſins, without a Compact determining (either by name or qualification) the perſons that ſhould be pardoned in the virtue of his Death, or only purchaſed the Goſpel-Covenant, as conditionally offering Pardon; I ſhould agree with Mr. *Humfrey*: But it being otherwiſe, I differ from him. And I add, that as the poſſeſſed effects are not properly imputed, ſo I will not confine the ſupport of my Faith ultimately, and only, to the Goſpel conditional promiſe, (tho' that's infallible;) when God hath made the Compact between the Father and our Mediator to be my Security, and Chriſt's performance of the conditions of that Compact to be my Plea with God; among which conditions was what anſwers the Law of works, which I have tranſgreſſed: Altho' I own, I muſt try my Intereſt by Chriſt's Goſpel-Law, as what deſcribeth the perſon who is entitled to Pardon,

Pardon, and enjoineth us to be ſuch, with a promiſe of that Intereſt. In ſhort, a Believer having for his Security and Plea, the Goſpel-promiſe, the Covenant of Redemption, and the value of Chriſt's Death, I'll retain each; and therefore ſtill ſay, *Beſides the effects poſſeſſed by me, the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed to me*, as above accounted for. SECT. V.

ON the other hand, Could I think, it was by the Covenant of works, that Chriſt was conſtituted *our Surety*, ſo that his obligations to ſuffer the Puniſhment of our ſins, did *immediately* reſult from that Law: And that we Sinners were *Principals in Redemption-work*, and Chriſt ſuch a *Surety* as to be a *joint Party* with us in that work of Redemption: And that the Law of works required the *Divine Nature*, to give a value to what it accounted to be Righteouſneſs: And laſtly, that this Law *promiſeth Pardon* to Sinners, for the ſake of a Mediator's ſufferings: I ſhould then agree with Mr. *Lobb*, that we ſatisfied for our ſin, died and obeyed in Chriſt's Perſon, and he and we paid the *idem*. Nay, I ſhould be a full *Criſpian*, and ſay, I was *juſtified* at the time of Chriſt's Death; I had *nothing to do* to become a partaker of the effects of that Death; I was *as righteous as Chriſt*: And ſo ſhould deny any proper forgiveneſs; nay, and own, that Chriſt was *really a Sinner*; for I am ſure,

SECT. V.

the Law could *immediately* oblige no other to die.

BUT I muſt diſagree with Mr. *Lobb* and them, Becauſe I am well perſuaded, that God never propoſed the work of Redemption to condemned Sinners, but to Chriſt our Mediator: Alſo, that to the Redemption of Sinners, God in Juſtice requiring for the honour of his violated Law, that a perfect obedience, and the ſuffering of what was equivalent to its threatned Puniſhment, ſhould in the Human Nature be ſubmitted to by the Redeemer; our bleſſed Mediator obliged himſelf to yield that obedience, and to bear thoſe Puniſhments, upon condition that ſuch Sinners ſhould be forgiven in his Right, who ſhould comply with the Goſpel-terms agreed upon between the Father and him; and purſuant hereto, our Mediator did in our Nature perfectly obey and ſuffer the Puniſhment of our ſins, whereby he had a Right to a believer's Pardon, and believers do obtain it in the way above deſcribed: And laſtly, I am ſure the Law of works never promiſeth Pardon to Sinners for the ſake of Chriſt's ſufferings; the Payment of the full *Idem* was impoſſible, (tho' there was a ſupra-equivalent;) and the Law accounteth that Righteouſneſs perfect, which an innocent holy Creature renders, tho' he have not the Divine Nature to give that value to his obedience, without

without which very thing we had been entirely loſt. SECT. V.

HERE Mr. *Lobb* may find *a Surety, viz.* an *obliged Mediator:* And *under the Law, viz.* as an Article taken into the Covenant of Redemption, whereby Chriſt was obliged: And *in our ſtead, viz.* we were condemned to ſuffer, and we are by and for his ſufferings to be ſaved. Nay, he may find the *ſound meaning* of his other Phraſes, as *Change of Perſons*, yea, *Chriſt's ſuffering in the Perſon of Sinners*; that is, Chriſt our obliged Mediator ſuffers *in our ſtead* what we were to ſuffer; yet it was, that we might be delivered for it, but not legally reputed our ſelves to ſuffer. And yet here's place left for Pardon, a Goſpel-Law, Terms of Application, *&c.*

THAT none may miſtake, note, (1.) I inſtance Pardon, *&c.* for brevity ſake, but exclude no ſaving benefits; and I diſtinguiſh ſaving benefits, which are uſed as motives to duty in the Goſpel, from the duties which are conditions of thoſe benefits. And therefore, (2.) I ſpeak not of Chriſt's peculiar purchaſing Grace for the Elect, effectually to perform thoſe Conditions, whereby, together with the Decree, their eventual Salvation is ſecured. This is my Judgment; but I ought not to confound this with that adjuſtment of things, whereby the Goſpel-Offer of Salvation to all men, and the Goſpel-Rule of conferring

SECT. V. its benefits, and of our final Judgment, are provided for.

Mr. *Lobb* oft objects a Contradiction, if I affirm *a Change of Perſons*, and yet ſay, I deny there is *a Change of Perſon*.

Anſw. BESIDES Anſwers already given, I ſay, without any deſign'd Affront, it's no greater, than *Anſwer not a Fool according to his Folly*, yet *Anſwer a Fool according to his Folly*.

BY thus gratifying Mr. *Lobb*'s imperious humour, I am the freer to tell him,

(1.) I AM ſorry, that he ſo boldly averreth many *groſs miſtakes* in matters of Fact. Thus, *pag.* 35. *I invented the Phraſe, Change of Perſon*; whereas I cite and uſe it as Dr. *Criſp*'s Phraſe.—*Pag.* 29, 43. *I deny a Change of Perſons*; whereas I never denied it; what I denied was Dr. *Criſp*'s Change of Perſon, and I fully aſſerted the Senſe of the other.—*Pag.* 22. *I appealed to the learned* Witſius; but this I never did. — *Pag.* 7. *That only Mr.* Toland *wrote much in praiſe of my Book*; whereas he being then in *Holland*, (and not the man he ſince appears,) deſired them who gave an account of publiſhed Books, to give their Judgment of my Book, and the great Praiſes are theirs; and others have ſince commended it above its worth.—*Pag.* 63. *That I was the Contriver of the Third Paper*; whereas others had drawn it up before I ſaw it. — His vile Reflections on

Mr.

Mr. *R.* with reſpect to this, and his *Nine Subſcribers of the Firſt Paper*, *pag.* 70. makes an account of that Matter neceſſary. The *united Miniſters* appointed Dr. *Bates*, Mr. *Hammond*, Mr. *Slater*, Mr. *Hill*, with Mr. *Howe* and myſelf, to compoſe an Expedient, *&c.* Two of the Brethren drew it up, (which is this *Third Paper*,) and brought it to the reſt of us met together: After ſome alterations we did all agree to it, and brought it as our agreed Act to the meeting at *St. Helens.* There, among the reſt, Mr. *Stretton*, Mr. *Quick*, and Mr. *Evans* agreed to it. Mr. *Alſop*, Mr. *Burgeſs*, and Mr. *Shower*, not being preſent any of the times when it was read in the meeting; it was brought to the view of Mr. *Alſop*, who approved of it: I am very ſure alſo, it was ſhewn to Mr. *Burgeſs*, (his Informer,) who appeared to agree to it; and Mr. *Shower* did to more than one expreſs his approbation of it. So that Mr. *Lobb* hath all the *Nine Subſcribers* to my Book enumerated.—Mr. *Lobb* ſomewhere ſaith, *All the Phraſes* of the *Firſt Paper*, not in the *Third*, were *rejected by my means*: And yet ſeveral of them are in *my own Paper*, called the *Second*; which I am glad was printed ere I read his Defence.—He ſaith, *The Third Paper* denies *a Commutation of Perſons*; *pag.* 14. when both Phraſe and Senſe are in it.——Other Inſtances are not wanting. It's falſe, that

SECT. V.

SECT. V. the *generality of the Paſtors* do not approve my Book; though they were aſked only to ſubſcribe the ſtate of Truths and Errors.

(2.) THE Cauſe he undertakes is *miſerably defended* againſt the *Rebuke*. He appears to give, *pag.* 13. a Scheme of his project, *viz.* the Points *left out* of the *Third Paper* which offended the Brethren: But where's his Proof, that the *united Miniſters* were obliged to retain ſo many Phraſes of the *Firſt Paper*, as they did? If they had uſed none, but what the Church of *England* and the *Aſſembly* of Divines *Confeſſion* included, the *Heads of Union* were obſerved by them, and violated by ſuch as exacted more. Where makes he it good, that the *united Miniſters* rejected all the Phraſes of the *Firſt Paper* which they omitted; eſpecially when it was never read nor propoſed to them? Or that the *omiſſion* of thoſe Phraſes warrants the breach of *Union?* Such matters ought not to paſs unargued, without which none can tell *what honeſt cauſe* the *Report* pretends to, unleſs the traducing men ſound in the Faith, to cover the turbulency of the Erroneous, ſhould be ſo accounted. As theſe are waved, ſo he *trifles* on what he pretends to inſiſt on. —— Mr. *R.* demands the difference between a *Commutation of Perſons* between Chriſt and Sinners, and *Chriſt's dying* properly *in the Sinners ſtead.*

Mr.

Mr. *Lobb* grants they are ſame; and yet poureth out a Flood of impertinent words againſt the *Rebuker*, as if they widely differed.—Mr. *Lobb* makes *Chriſt's ſuffering the Puniſhment of our ſins to the Satisfaction of Juſtice*, the thing which diſtinguiſheth the Orthodox from the *Socinians*: And yet he repreſents Mr. *R.* as a *Socinian*, who oft aſſerteth, *Chriſt ſuffered the Puniſhment of our ſins to the Satisfaction of Juſtice*, even vindictive Juſtice.—Mr. *R.* chargeth his account of *Change of Perſons*, *Rep. pag.* 5. with little leſs than Blaſphemy: He bears that with the profoundeſt ſilence.——Mr. *R.* blames him, that he gave not a *full Report* of our Difference, and from its Riſe: To this he ſaith, *He pretended not to give a Narrative of the whole*: And yet, *Rep. pag.* 4. he ſaith, *The Difference hitherto hath been about the Satisfaction of Chriſt*; and in his *Remarks*, he oft leads his Reader to judge we never had any other Controverſy.—Indeed his *preſent State* of the Difference was ſuch a Piece of Art, as he thought it ſo much pity to ſpoil it by a fuller account, that their violation of the *Agreement of Doctrines*, 1692. he anſwers only with a groan.---Their refuſal of the Paper, 1694. becauſe *a diſowning* of ſundry *Antinomian Errors* was added; he excuſeth no better than by an abrupt Diſmiſs, after a Suggeſtion, that *nothing had been* SECT. V.

added

SECT. V.

added but that about *Repentance*, which is not true: And yet this being in the *Aſſembly's* words, he impeacheth the *Refuſers* as *inſincere*, in ſubſcribing this in the *Aſſembly's Confeſſion*, and yet refuſing it in that Paper.----To the *horrid Paſſages* out of his Brethren's Books, collected to juſtify a demand of ſatisfaction, and a fit Antidote when he formed their *Creeds*; with him 'tis enough to ſay, *they were not ſent to Pinners-Hall*; as if it matter'd not, that he knew, they were in their Books, and before the *united Miniſters*.----What ſaith he to Mr. *R*'s citations out of my Book, fully aſſerting Chriſt's Satisfaction? *ne γευ quidem*, but caluminates ſtill.-----Where ſtates he a fair Queſtion with the *Rebuker*? Inſtead of that he purſues a *Logomachy*, and cites Authors to prove what Mr. *R.* pleads for, and to confute what his Party reckons he defends, yea, what himſelf oft-times aſſerts. *Phraſes* he tires, when the Senſe is ſo diſregarded, that I would thank him to ſhew *one Error* of Mr. *R.* (unleſs by groſs wreſting of his words,) he once remarketh; or *one Doctrinal Truth* he pretends to prove, which Mr. *R.* hath not expreſsly own'd.----Upon the whole, the Cauſe of the *Rebuke* is ſtill unhurt, otherwiſe than as its Author is pelted with his ſmootheſt *Brother's* rotten Eggs; ſuch as, *not having a grain of Senſe, heretical, falſe, delirious, changeling*, and what not? But

as

as for the Cauſe of *the Report*, the Defendant has wiſely got that into a *Wood*, in hopes his Party ſhall not find it is dead by the *Rebuker*'s wounds. SECT. V.

(3.) I WILL foretell from what I already hear and ſee, how ſeveral ſorts are likely to judge, and ſtand affected to his Performance.—His *Diſciples* may ſay, All we have learned is even this: *A Change of Perſons*, and *Chriſt's ſuffering in our Perſon*, if explained to a ſound Senſe, are no more than *Chriſt's ſuffering properly in our ſtead:* And yet *Chriſt's ſuffering properly in our ſtead*, is not ſo much *a Change of Perſons*, or *ſuffering in our Perſon*, but that we muſt call them *Socinians*, who hold *Chriſt ſuffered in our ſtead*, if they will omit any of our Maſter's Phraſes, altho' they own the Senſe of all. ——The ſagacious *Criſpians* (if any ſuch,) will ſay, He hath betrayed our Cauſe; yea, himſelf condemns it, and anon eſpouſeth it: But one good turn is done, he hath toiled hard to ſpoil what is a real Confutation of it.——The *factious Bigots* may glory, Whatever becomes of Truth, yet it's worth *our Contribution*, that he has ſpoiled all hopes of that ill thing, *Union*, and Peace too; and has put the *united Miniſters* to groan, We are abuſed, and as far as *this Pacificator* can influence, our Breaches ſhall ſtill be wider.—They whom he

SECT. V. he *remarked*, ſaying, *The Diſſenters differ about they know not what*, will loudly boaſt, *We now ſee with a witneſs*, that even *the only man of cloſe ſtudy*, yea, that *no man* can gueſs what it is about.—They who uſed to truſt to *Quotations* from Authors, muſt grow ſuſpicious, and reſolve always to examine.—Hard Students (ſome ſuch there are beſides Mr. *Lobb*,) will dread a *Common-place-Book of Phraſes*, leſt they ſhould divert them from their more important Senſe, and confound themſelves to the diſtracting of the Church, and the torment of all Mankind.—— It's well if ſome of his *reproached Preachers* ſay not, We ſtudy Things more than Words; and yet Words, more than to ſpeak *falſe Engliſh*, that we may ſtrut in bombaſtick Phraſes; and both to better purpoſe than our aſſuming Dictator, who brands us with Ignorance, and a *Zeal for Populacy*; whilſt his Gain by our more common acceptance, qualifies him for a ſort of *cloſer Study*; but in time we may become more politick. ----- But which more affects me, *plain ſerious Chriſtians* with grief will cry, We know not what to think, if the way to Heaven be thus perplexed, and the Articles of our Faith ſo intricate as theſe heaps of obſcure Phraſes repreſent them.—The *Profane* are tempted to ſcoff at Religion, as a wordy Noiſe; and our *Enemies* well pleaſed, to ſee us deſtroy each other by dividing, and this

this for what expoſeth as much to Contempt as Ruin.—How much ſhould we pray for *godly Sincerity* in our appeals to God, and Serviceableneſs to a common good in our pretended pleadings for Truth! and not ſtill amuſe men, as Mr. *Lobb* hath done by a Book, the Subſtance whereof is no more than a Miſrepreſentation of the *Rebuker*'s Words, that the Reader may believe him *an Heretick in grain*, when the plain Senſe of his Expreſſion ſeems oft contended for by Mr. *Lobb*. Nor can people propoſe a benefit by multiplied Quotations of a Phraſe, when the Authors, who uſe it, deſign by that Phraſe no more than Mr. *R.* grants; and his Exception is not againſt their Senſe of that Phraſe, but againſt impoſing it as a Term of Union, after the *Criſpians* and Mr. *Lobb* had ſo perverted it.

SECT. V.

A

POSTSCRIPT

Added to

The THIRD EDITION

OF

Goſpel-Truth ſtated &c.

For clearing

Sundry TRUTHS objected againſt, *&c.*

Printed in the Year 1698.

A

POSTSCRIPT

Added to

The THIRD EDITION

OF

[illegible]

For vindicating

Sundry TRUTHS objected against, &c.

Printed in the Year 1698.

A POSTSCRIPT to the Third Edition of *Goſpel-Truth ſtated &c.*

THE Intereſt of the opinions and perſons of *Antinomians* in this City did amazingly appear, in a violent oppoſition to this Book, and perſecution of its Author, by a great Party among the *Independents* and *Anabaptiſts*. To ſuch as will not read what they are bid to rail at, I wiſh a more impartial Judgment than to act thus blindly, leſt they be found to reſiſt the Truths of Chriſt, and that for purpoſes too carnal to be approved by upright men, when their Eyes are open. But my preſent concern is with ſuch of the pretended Confuters of this Book, as deſerve *any regard*. Several of them plainly avow *Criſpianiſm* in its vileſt Doctrines: Others divert the Controverſy to occaſional expreſſions, upon which the cauſe I manage had no dependance; but theſe agree with the reſidue of their Aſſociates, to miſ-repreſent my Principles, and with clouded confuſion to ſtate their own. Tho' the diſingenuity of my *Antagoniſts* would be ſufficiently manifeſt, upon the Reader's peruſal of the places they cite out of my

Book; yet that I may not give Satan any advantage againſt the *Cauſe of Chriſt*, wherein I am engaged, I ſhall propoſe the conſiderable Objections offered againſt this Book, and ſhew, where *on my part* the difference is not, and wherein it truly conſiſts, between me and the Objectors; if their exceptions are *ſincerely* made.

SECT. I.

A Reply to the Objections in a Paper ſigned by ſeveral Brethren.

SECT. I. I SHALL chiefly inſiſt on a Paper, ſigned in the year 1692. by Mr. *Griffith*, Mr. *Cole*, Mr. *Mather*, Mr. *Chauncy*, Mr. *Trayl*, and Mr. *Richard Taylor*; and in part printed in *Neonomianiſm unmaſked*, part iii. *pag.* 96. Wherein they except againſt the following places in *Goſpel-Truth ſtated*, under theſe Seven Objections.

1 Obj. I. *We find Truth and Error not rightly ſtated in ſeveral particulars*; Chap. ii, v, vii, viii, xii, xvi, xviii, xix. *and in other places.*

Anſw. THE meaning of this *Objection* (as further explained by one of the principal of theſe Brethren,) is, That what I ſtate as *TRUTH* in the beginning of each of

of theſe Chapters, they eſteem to be an *ERROR*; and what I call an *ERROR*, they think to be a *TRUTH*. The Reader cannot be juſt to himſelf, or me, if he peruſe not what I call *Truth* and *Error*; and then let him excuſe the Objectors from favouring the very dregs of *Antinomianiſm*, eſpecially if he know what thoſe *other places* be, which they thought leſs fit to mention. SECT. I.

Obj. II. *Under a colour of oppoſing ſome old* Antinomian *Errors, (which we from our hearts abhor,) he falls in with them in their main Principle of vacating the Sanction of the moral Law.* Pref. *pag.* ix, x. Book, *pag.* 142, 147.

Anſw. (1.) IT were their intereſt, that they could (without a breach among themſelves) agree to name one *Antinomian* Error they abhor; when this Book ſtates ſo many, their Advocates plead for each, and they have ſo often been called thereto in vain. Not to mention, how their Pulpits entertain, and they patronize, ſuch as Mr. *Davies*, Mr. *Jacob*, &c.

(2.) As for their own opinion concerning the *Law*, it comes in effect to worſe than the Error they object againſt. They are for the *Law* given to *Adam* (and no other) to be in force; but behold the manner! *viz.* The *Law* delivered to *Adam* as a Covenant of works, promiſing life upon

SECT. I. no lower conditions than perfect obedience, and threatning death for the leaſt ſin, is ſtill *the only Law* or Covenant, that appoints to Sinners the conditions of obtaining Salvation. But if we *object*, that by this notion all men muſt be unavoidably damned: They *anſwer*, Every elect perſon hath already fulfilled *Adam's Law* or Covenant *in Chriſt*; that is, the Elect have in Chriſt endured the curſe to the Satisfaction of Juſtice, and perfectly obeyed its precepts too; and therefore they are juſtified before God by *Adam's Law:* Nor doth the Goſpel require Faith or Repentance, as any condition of Pardon or Life, nor denounce any threatning for the want of them, or for any other ſin.

THIS being their notion of the *Law*, who ſees, what more influence it can have upon Practice, than if its Sanction (if not Precept too,) were vacated? For the *Curſe* can be of no uſe to deter ſuch from ſin, who have already endured it, and are guilty of unbelief if they any more fear it, or any other threatning for ſin. Nor yet can imperfect Obedience avail for any benefit, when *no Promiſe* is made thereto: Nay, the *Elect* having perfectly obeyed in Chriſt, are therefore entitled by *Adam's Law* to its entire reward: But as for others, they have *no conditions* propoſed to them, for eſcaping the Curſe, or obtaining the Bleſſing. And thus they make the *Law* to be

paſſed

paſſed into a Sentence, (*viz.* a mere *juſtifying Sentence* upon all the Elect, and an irrevocably *damning Sentence* upon all the Non-elect;) which is far worſe, than what they exclaim againſt as an Error in others; who uſe that phraſe, to ſhew that the Reward is not attainable by the Obedience of them who have once ſinned; while yet they aſſert *a remedial Law* with Threats and Promiſes, affecting the fears and hopes of men as they obey Chriſt, yea, and the Law-curſe to abide on unbelievers: Whereas by this notion all ſuch Guards are wanting. I ſhall now ſtate this point as it concerneth me. SECT. I.

THE *Difference is not*, (1.) Whether the preceptive part of the moral Law be a rule of manners, and every violation thereof *a ſin?* (2.) Nor whether all who *believe not*, are *ſtill* under the Curſe of the Law? (3.) Nor whether we are *ſtill condemnable* by the Law for the defects of our Obedience, except the Goſpel did provide a Pardon? (4.) Nor whether the *Obedience of Chriſt*, for which we are juſtified, muſt be at leaſt *adequate* to the moral Law? All theſe I affirm, *G. Truth*, *pag.* 165, 64, 142, 117, 17, 46. Pref. *pag.* ix. (See alſo *Def. of G. Truth*, pag. 300.) And therefore it is a falſe Charge, that I hold *the Sanction of the moral Law is vacated:* I never ſaid it. It is true indeed, I ſaid, *The Sanction is ſo removed,*

SECT. I. *as not to hinder our Relief by the Goſpel*; pag. 147. which if it were not, our Caſe were as deſperate as the Devils. I affirmed alſo, *It is a falſe notion of Free Grace, that when the Curſe of the Law is removed*, (as it is from Believers,) *God cannot expreſs any diſpleaſure againſt them when moſt provoked*; pag. 264. The plain meaning whereof is, That tho' believers are delivered from the *damning Curſe of the Law*, yet there be many penal Afflictions threatned in the Goſpel for ſuch ſins as believers may fall into. I alſo ſaid, *The Goſpel hath another Sanction to the preceptive part of the Law, as taken into the Goſpel*; Pref. *pag.* ix, x. which muſt be true, if the Redeemer enjoin thoſe Precepts, and the Goſpel have a Sanction. But tho' I ſay in this reſpect there is *a Change*, yet this hinders not, but that thoſe Precepts, conſidered as ſtill in the moral Law, are under the *ſame Law-Sanction* as they were at firſt.

THE *Difference is*, (1.) Whether by the Curſe of the Law the ſins of the Elect are imputed to them to condemnation, *in foro Juſtitiæ*, while they are unbelievers? This they deny, and I affirm. (2.) Is perfect Obedience to the moral Law the loweſt condition of Salvation propoſed by Chriſt to ſinners? This they affirm, and I deny. (3.) Are Infidelity, Impenitency, and reigning Wickedneſs, as much the accepted

accepted conditions of Goſpel-Pardon and Salvation, as *unfeigned Faith, true Repentance*, and *ſincere Obedience*, tho' each be imperfect? This they affirm, and I deny. Of which more hereafter. SECT. I.

Obj. III. *To ſupply the room of the moral Law vacated by him, he turns the Goſpel into a new Law, in keeping of which we ſhall be juſtified for the ſake of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs*; pag. 49, 138, 152, 229. *making qualifications and acts of ours a diſpoſing ſubordinate Righteouſneſs, whereby we become capable of being juſtified by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs*. Pag. 60, 61, 69, 76, 108, 112, 114, 124, 142, 155, 159.

Anſw. READ the places, and thou wilt be convinced, theſe men will have the *Object* on whom the juſtifying Act of God terminateth, to be an impenitent Infidel; whereby we ſhall be *juſtified* as much *by works* as *by faith*, that is, by neither. *Abraham* would not be the *pattern* of a ſinner's Juſtification, for he *believed* that he might be *juſtified*. Nor could *faith* in any ſenſe *be imputed for righteouſneſs*; for it would not be Chriſt *believed on* who juſtified, but Chriſt *not believed on*. All which are contrary to the very ſcope of *Rom.* iv. as well as to the inferred concluſion, *ver.* 23, 24.

THE *Difference is not*, (1.) Whether the Goſpel be *a new Law* in the *Socinian*, *Popiſh*,

SECT. I. *Popiſh*, or *Arminian* ſenſe? This I deny. See it ſtated, *Defence of G. Truth*, pag. 346, 347. (2.) Nor whether *faith*, or any other grace, or act of ours, is any atonement for ſin, ſatisfaction to Juſtice, meriting qualification, or any part of *that righteouſneſs* for which we are juſtified at God our Creator's Bar? This I deny in places innumerable; yea, in thoſe objected, *pag.* 112, 114, 124. (3.) Nor whether the Goſpel be a Law *more new* than is implied in the firſt promiſe to fallen *Adam*, propoſed to *Cain*, and obeyed by *Abel*, to the differencing him from his unbelieving brother? This I deny. (4.) Nor whether the Goſpel be a Law that *allows ſin*, when it accepts ſuch *graces* as are *true*, tho' ſhort of perfection, to be the *conditions* of our perſonal intereſt in the benefits *purchaſed by Chriſt?* This I deny. (5.) Nor whether the Goſpel be a Law, the promiſes whereof entitle the performers of its conditions to the benefits as *of debt?* This I deny, *pag.* 64, 67.

THE *Difference is*, (1.) Is the Goſpel *a Law* in this ſenſe? *viz.* that God in Chriſt *thereby commandeth* Sinners to repent of ſin, and receive Chriſt by a true operative faith; *promiſing* that thereupon, they ſhall be united to him, juſtified by his righteouſneſs, pardoned and adopted; and that perſevering in faith and true holineſs, they ſhall be finally ſaved; alſo *threatning*, that

that if any ſhall die impenitent, unbeliev- SECT.
ing, ungodly rejecters of his grace, they I.
ſhall periſh without relief, and endure *ſorer puniſhments* than if theſe offers had not been made to them. (2.) Hath the Goſpel *a Sanction?* that is, Doth Chriſt therein inforce his commands of faith, repentance, and perſeverance, by the foreſaid promiſes and threatnings, as motives to our obedience? Both theſe I affirm; and they deny, ſaying the Goſpel in the largeſt ſenſe is an *abſolute promiſe* without precepts or conditions, and *a Goſpel-threat is a Bull.* See this Law and Sanction proved, *pag.* 145, to 159. and *Def. of G. Truth, pag.* 348, *& ſeq.* (3.) Do the Goſpel-*promiſes* of benefits to certain graces, and its *threats*, that thoſe benefits ſhall be withheld, and the contrary evils inflicted for the neglect of ſuch graces, render thoſe graces the *condition* of our perſonal title to thoſe benefits? This they deny, and I affirm. (4.) Are impenitent *Infidels* while ſuch, *incapable* by the Goſpel-conſtitution, to be juſtified by Chriſt's righteouſneſs? This they deny, and I affirm. (5.) Do the *promiſes* of the Goſpel infallibly entitle by gift, the performers of their reſpective conditions, to the benefits promiſed thereupon? This they deny, and I affirm. (6.) Seeing the Goſpel promiſeth pardon and life to all ſuch as believe, (to be enjoyed in the virtue of Chriſt's obedience,)

is

SECT. I.

is *faith imputed for righteouſneſs*, as far as it is the performed condition upon which the Goſpel-promiſe gives pardon and life to him that believeth, in *oppoſition* to him who believeth not? This I affirm, and they deny: Of which more hereafter,

MIGHT not Peace be more in proſpect, if we could diſtinguiſh, [1.] Between a *Command* exacting and directing duty, and a *Promiſe* determining ſome degree of that duty to be the *Condition* of a benefit? This would convince us, that the Goſpel is not a Law that *allows ſin*. [2.] Between benefits conſidered as to be *merited by us*, and *applying to us* thoſe benefits as merited and procured by Chriſt. [3.] Between God's adjuſting a right to, and diſtributing benefits by *governing Juſtice* towards man without a Mediator; and by *governing Grace* giving a right and diſtributing benefits to ſinners, for our *Mediator's ſake*; by whom Satisfaction was made to governing Juſtice, and thoſe benefits purchaſed.

Obj. IV. *He denies the Covenant of Grace to be made with Chriſt as the* Second Adam, *and in him with all the Elect as his ſeed*; pag. 59. *and that the Covenant is pleadable by us, as it was made with Chriſt.* Pref. *pag.* x.

Anſw. CONSULT the places, and you'll find, all the cauſe for this is, that I diſtinguiſh

ſtinguiſh the *Covenant of Redemption*, wherein Juſtice fixed the terms of the *impetration* of benefits, which Chriſt alone was engaged to perform; and the *Goſpel-Covenant*, (which for diſtinction ſake I called the *Covenant of Grace*,) the terms of which we are to perform, tho' in the ſtrength of Chriſt it is that we do that. SECT. I.

THE *Difference is not*, (1.) If you call the *Covenant of Redemption* by the name of the *Covenant of Grace*, whether it was made with Chriſt? This I affirm in the objected place. (2.) Nor whether Chriſt engaging in the *Covenant of Redemption*, may be called the *Second Adam* ſo far, as that what he engaged was for the Salvation of all that ſhall believe; and that no man can be ſaved, but in the virtue of *his righteouſneſs*; and he hath undertaken, that the Elect ſhall believe and be ſaved? This I oft affirm, *pag.* 44, 63. (3.) Nor whether all men may encourage themſelves in prayer, by what was promiſed to Chriſt, and by the abſolute promiſes of Grace? This I affirm. (4.) Nor whether the *Goſpel-Covenant* gives *Chriſt's Seed*, that is, believers, a right to plead Chriſt's *performance of the terms of the Covenant of Redemption*, as their Security of enjoying what was promiſed *to Chriſt for his Seed*, and is in the *Goſpel-Covenant* promiſed *to themſelves*? All I this affirm.

THE *Difference is*, (1.) Ought we to diſtinguiſh

SECT. I. diſtinguiſh between the *Covenant of Redemption*, which adjuſteth *the terms* of Satisfaction, and *Impetration of Salvation for us*, (which Chriſt alone was to perform,) and the *Goſpel-Covenant*, which appoints *the way and conditions of applying to us* that impetrated Salvation? This they deny, and I affirm. (2.) Was the *Covenant of Redemption* made with all the Elect? that is, Did the Elect covenant with God, that *they* ſhould make their Souls an Offering for Sin, or that *Chriſt* ſhould make his Soul an Offering for Sin? This they affirm, and I deny. (3.) Were the Elect, while unbelievers, properly *the ſeed of Chriſt*? This they affirm, and I deny; becauſe Chriſt was to *raiſe a ſeed* by *making them* believers, and the Elect were *given him* ſo to raiſe. (4.) Can any unbeliever plead with God, that he hath *a perſonal right* to the promiſe of the firſt grace, and that God were *unfaithful to him* if he give it not? This they affirm, and I deny; tho' I grant, Chriſt can plead it, and the giving it is an act of faithfulneſs to him. (5.) Is the *Goſpel-Covenant* made perſonally with fallen man? that is, *propoſed to all men* where the Goſpel comes, and ratified *abſolutely to believers* for their intereſt in its benefits? This they deny, and I affirm. (6.) Is the *Goſpel-Covenant*, which offers ſalvation to ſinners on the terms of faith and repentance, made between the *Father*

Father as one party, and between *Chriſt and us in him* as the other party? Or is it made between *God in Chriſt* as one party, and *us* as the other party? The former they affirm, and I deny; becauſe ſo it could not be the *Teſtament* of Chriſt, which it plainly is: The latter they deny, and I affirm; becauſe the true queſtion will be, Is *Chriſt* to believe and repent *for us?* and is *his doing ſo* the condition of our obtaining the pardon, which the Goſpel promiſeth, and which he procured by his obedience? Nor can I forbear to wonder that men think, if *thou Sinner* wilt believe, and if *thou Chriſt* wilt *enable Sinners* to believe, ſhould be the ſame condition; whereas *enabling* is Chriſt's act, but *believing* is our act; and *this our Act* is the Goſpel condition.

SECT. I.

Obj. V. *He teacheth, that the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed only as to effects, with the purchaſe of a conditional grant*, viz. *this propoſition, He that believeth ſhall be ſaved.* Pag. 43, 57.

Anſw. My words are, *pag.* 44. "Beſides theſe effects being made ours, *the very righteouſneſs of Chriſt* [it ſelf] *is imputed* to true believers:" and *pag.* 43. "Chriſt merited for *all the Elect*, that "they ſhould in his time and way *be certainly partakers* of its ſaving effects; "and *did not only purchaſe* a conditional "grant,

SECT. I. "grant, *viz.* this propoſition, *He that believeth ſhall be ſaved.*" Do not they induce men to think, that I ſaid, we are partakers *only of the effects* of Chriſt's death; but that *his righteouſneſs* it ſelf *is not imputed* to us? Alſo that I *denied*, that Chriſt merited for *all the Elect*, that they ſhould *believe and be ſaved?* Which are ſo contrary to my words, that it ſhould induce all honeſt men to deprecate the power of a faction.

THE *Difference is not*, (1.) Whether *Chriſt's righteouſneſs* it ſelf *be imputed* to believers, as well as that *the effects of it* are poſſeſſed by them? This I oft affirm. (2.) Nor whether Chriſt hath merited, that *all the Elect* ſhall certainly *believe and be ſaved?* This I affirm.

THE *Difference is*, (1.) As to the *Covenant-Grant*, Whether the Goſpel-offer and promiſed Grant to fallen ſinners, *viz.* that *if they will believe they ſhall be ſaved*, be merited by Chriſt? This they deny, and I affirm; becauſe God might, as conſiſtently with his Juſtice and the honour of his Government, *ſave believing ſinners* without a reſpect to Chriſt's merits; as *offer* and promiſe *Salvation* to ſinners, *if they will believe*, without a reſpect to the Death of Chriſt, as what vindicated his Juſtice and Government in treating thus with ſinners, whom *his own Law condemneth*; nay *rather*, becauſe his *ſaving of*

believers

believers after ſuch a grant, is an act of *faithfulneſs to them*, that being the execution of the Goſpel-grant, to which he is ſelf-engaged by his word. (2.) Whether the death of Chriſt is legally eſteemed to be endured *by us*, and his obedience to be performed *by us*? Or whether they are *imputed* to believers, as their *pleadable ſecurity* for their pardon and title to eternal life in the right of Chriſt? The former they affirm, and I deny: The latter I affirm, and they deny; becauſe it allows them not to ſay, that *they* are adjudged by God legally to have made *Satisfaction to Juſtice*; as they muſt be, if they endured thoſe Sufferings *in Chriſt*, which were *accepted* for Satisfaction; unleſs they'll ſay, that Chriſt's Sufferings were not ſo accepted for Satisfaction. Nor will it permit them to conceit, they are *as righteous as Chriſt*, which they muſt be, if they are adjudged to have perfectly *obeyed* the Law *in him*: Nay they muſt be *as holy as Chriſt too*, unleſs they can be juſtified without habitual holineſs by a Law that requireth habitual holineſs to perfection. Not to inſiſt how inconſiſtent their notion is with *forgiveneſs of ſin*; unleſs that man be *capable of pardon*, whom God judgeth to have ſuffered the penalty, to have perfectly obeyed, and to be habitually holy, according to the full demands of the Law. To do, ſuffer, and

SECT. I.

be

SECT. I.

be all this *in Chriſt*, and yet be pardoned *for the ſake* of what *he* ſuffered, was, and did, I cannot reconcile; unleſs I could find, that we are *not pardoned* for the ſake of what *he* did and ſuffered, or that he did and ſuffered ſomewhat for our pardon which we are not judged to do and ſuffer *in him*.

I HAVE largely treated of the matter of this Objection, in *Man made righteous*, pag. 87, to 94, and in the *Anſwer to the Report*, pag. 452, to 455, as a reply to the Reverend Mr. *Humfrey* and Mr. *Lobb*. Yet I will offer a few thoughts on this point.

[1.] Mr. *Humfrey* ordereth his conceptions, as if there were no *Covenant of Redemption*, or *Law of Mediation*; and thence denies *the Imputation of Chriſt's righteouſneſs it ſelf* to us: For *in ſe*, amounts to no more, in oppoſition to me. Mr. *Lobb*, with theſe Brethren, ſpeak in the other extream, as if there were no *Goſpel-Covenant*, or *Law*, but only a *Covenant of Redemption*; and this leads them to deny *a Goſpel-righteouſneſs*. Whereas a due regard to both theſe Covenants, renders the *imputed righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, and a *Goſpel-righteouſneſs*, very conſiſtent; the *former*, as ſecuring us Sinners againſt the *Challenge of Juſtice* at the Creator's Bar; the *latter*, at the Redeemer's Bar, againſt the *Charge of rejecting Goſpel-Grace*. Without the *firſt*, no *Sinner*, tho' *a believer*, could be ſaved: And if there be no ſuch thing as a *Goſpel-righteouſneſs*,

teouſneſs, all invited Sinners muſt have an equal intereſt in the *Salvation offered*, as well as in the *Offer of it*, unleſs Chriſt will not judge them, or judge with reſpect of perſons: Of which hereafter. SECT. I.

[2.] I ASK no more as to a *Covenant of Redemption*, than ſuch a tranſaction between the Father and his Son our Mediator, whereby it's agreed, that if the Mediator ſhould *make his Soul an offering for ſin*, he ſhould *by his knowledge juſtify many*, and that *whoever believed on him ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting life*. Iſa liii. 10, 11. John iii. 16.

[3.] HERE is *a Promiſe made to Chriſt*, of the Juſtification and Salvation of all Believers; the only *condition* of which promiſe is the *death* of Chriſt, ſuppoſing his obedience adequate to the Law. The *faith* of men is no *condition* of this promiſe, but a *deſcription* of the Sinners whoſe Salvation is promiſed to Chriſt in reward of his death: (The Elect's being made believers is ſecured by another article:) And to Chriſt it is a reward *of debt*, becauſe the *condition* when admitted was proportioned by the claim of Juſtice.

[4.] UPON Chriſt's *performance* of this condition, *viz.* dying, this promiſe entitles him to this reward, *viz.* that all believing men, tho' fallen, ſhall be juſtified and ſaved: Which, conſidered as purſuant to this agreement, muſt be in the *ſole right* of Chriſt, whoſe reward it is, and who

SECT. I.

alone performed the condition of it.

[5.] THE Juſtification here promiſed being the Juſtification of a believing Sinner, and to be in Chriſt's right, it cannot be a conſtituting or declaring him, one that hath never ſinned, or that hath ſatisfied for his Sin: For this is neither true, nor poſſible; nor will the Law as to its violated precept admit the firſt, tho' it hath nothing to object againſt the Lawgiver's admitting a Satisfaction *equivalent* to its penal Sanction, and thereupon his pardoning the believing Sinner. Nor yet is this Juſtification to be taken in ſo low a ſenſe, as to be only a Pardon as an act of mere Sovereignty, which ſecures that the criminal ſhall not be puniſhed, but cannot be called *Juſtification.* But it imports, that the believing Sinner ſhall be pardoned *upon Chriſt's Satisfaction,* and be declared by God *not puniſhable* according to the curſe of the Law; becauſe the Lawgiver, as above the Law, yet ſecuring the ends and honour of it, hath ordained, agreed, and promiſed, that Chriſt's Death ſhould be admitted to ſatisfy for all the believing Sinner's offences; and that he ſhould be pardoned upon that, but yet *in his right* who made that Satisfaction. To be rendred and declared thus unpuniſhable, is *Juſtification.* And note, the matter in iſſue before a Judge when a man is accuſed as a Criminal, is this, Is he puniſhable, or is he

he not puniſhable? A Charge of faults takes no place as to a penal Sentence, if that Sentence lieth not againſt him for thoſe faults; and where it lies not againſt him, the man is juſtly abſolved from Condemnation. It's this Satisfaction of Chriſt by his death, upon which God declares the curſe of the Law cannot oblige the believer; tho' it is not *by the Law* God paſſeth that Sentence, but *by his promiſe*: The Law cannot *condemn* him, becauſe the Lawgiver hath admitted a Satisfaction; but it is not the Law that *juſtifieth* him, becauſe it declares no Sinner's abſolution upon another's Satisfaction. See *Rom.* viii. 33, 34. Τις εγκαλεσει; *who ſhall lay any thing to the charge of God's Elect?* what man or Devil ſhall object their Crimes, as obliging them to puniſhment? *It is God*, the ſupreme Lawgiver and Judge, *that juſtifieth*; he admitted a Satisfaction, and acquits them upon it: Τις ο κατακρινων; *who is he that condemneth?* that is, Is there any who urgeth the Sentence of the Law, the heinouſneſs of their Crimes, or the inſufficiency of the Satisfaction, in bar to his juſtifying them? He anſwers, *It is Chriſt that died.* Here's death for death; the death of the Lord of Glory, inſtead of the Sinner's death; and therefore God is not unjuſt, nor the Law injured, tho' the Sinner is pronounced unpuniſhable. SECT. I.

THE like might be ſaid, as to Adoption

SECT. I. to Glory upon the merits of Chriſt; but I want room to inſiſt on this branch of Juſtification.

[6.] WHEN Sinners do believe, they come under this Promiſe to Chriſt, and God *judicially declares* them the *deſcribed* perſons, in whom that promiſe to him is to be performed; *accounting* his death their ſecurity for their poſſeſſing that promiſed Juſtification and Salvation, to which he is entitled as part of his reward for enduring death: Moreover, he acknowledgeth Chriſt's death, and his right thereupon, to be the very *conſideration*, upon which he acquitteth theſe believers as *not puniſhable* with deſtructive puniſhments; and that no other ſatisfaction or merit is demandable from them; they being the perſons, who by the Covenant of Redemption were to be acquitted for what he did and ſuffered. It's true, the Goſpel enumerates the *effects* of Chriſt's death which believers are to receive in his right, and it promiſeth the ſame *to themſelves perſonally*; but the Goſpel-promiſe to them ſuppoſeth this Covenant of Redemption with Chriſt, as what accounteth for the grounds upon which ſuch Goſpel-promiſes could be made to *fallen Sinners*, and ſtateth their original ſecurity for poſſeſſing them now that they are believers.

[7.] THIS *Application* of Chriſt's death to believers as their ſecurity, his *judicial accounting*

counting them the Perſons in whom the Promiſe made to Chriſt is to be performed, and God's giving them Pardon and eternal Life, as the merited reward of his death and obedience, gives juſt ground for us to ſay, *the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed to believers.* They do not only enjoy Pardon, Adoption, and ſuch other *effects* of Chriſt's death; but *his Righteouſneſs it ſelf* is imputed to them, relatively to that Pardon, &c. Nor is leſs imported in our Prayers, that God would pardon and ſave us for the ſake of Chriſt's death and agonies; and ſprinkle his Blood upon us, and the like. SECT. I.

To make the utmoſt ſenſe of ſuch expreſſions, to refer to *his purchaſe* of the Goſpel-Covenant; were to confine his merits to the procuring of the Goſpel-Offer, and to diſown the benefits *granted* by that Covenant, to be the rewards *merited by Chriſt* according to the Covenant of Redemption, which gave him a right to our enjoyment of them. Surely God *gives* us Pardon and Salvation for Chriſt's ſake, as well as he *promiſeth* them for his ſake; eſpecially when they are ſuppoſed to be *purchaſed by him*, before they are promiſed to us on Goſpel-terms: Neither ſhould our Faith neglect to reſt on Chriſt's death as the price of Pardon, with the promiſe made to him that our Pardon ſhould be the reward of his death, as well as it ought to rely on

SECT. I. the Goſpel-promiſe *made to us*. But to add no more, How can Mr. *Humfrey* deny *the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt itſelf* to be imputed to us *as our pleadable ſecurity*, unleſs he'll deny that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is the *meriting cauſe* of our Pardon and eternal Life? Seeing any one that enjoys a benefit as *merited* for him *by another's Act*, hath *that meriting Act* imputed to him as his *pleadable ſecurity*, for his poſſeſſing that merited benefit in the right of him who performed that Action; this Action of him who merited is accounted to this other perſon, in bar to *Challenges* againſt his enjoying what was procured by it, tho' he be not accounted the perſon who performed that Action.

HAVING aſſerted *an imputed Righteouſneſs*, as far as the Scriptures warrant, as the ſafety and peace of a Chriſtian require, and as can conſiſt with the general offer of Salvation, and with Chriſt's proceeding with men as that offer is accepted or refuſed; I ſhall annex ſome hints concerning *Goſpel-Righteouſneſs*, in conformity to the Goſpel-Law as a Rule of Judgment.

1. THE Tranſactions in the Covenant of Redemption left room, and made way, for Chriſt's gracious and ſapiential Government of fallen men, as rational Creatures, (under reſtored influences,) and for his judging us as Objects of offered mercy. His *perfect Righteouſneſs* precluded not a rectoral

rectoral way of his *applying* it, with the effects thereof: *His right* to the believers Pardon and Glory, is conſiſtent with a Rule of giving them a *perſonal right thereto*; wherein his acquired Authority and Government over man ſhall be acknowledged, the Operations of the Holy Ghoſt honoured, and his purchaſed benefits uſed *as motives*, to make us ſuch as were by the Covenant of Redemption to be pardoned and glorified in his right, *viz.* Believers. SECT. I.

2. OUR bleſſed Redemer, by the Goſpel, declares what he had ſuffered and acquired, and therewith proclaims an Offer of his purchaſed benefits to fallen Men, (not Devils,) *commanding* their acceptance thereof; with a *promiſe* of inveſting them therein upon their compliance, and *threatning* their final refuſal with the want of theſe offered bleſſings, and becoming more miſerable. That this is *the Will of Chriſt*, is paſt doubt; And it muſt be the Goſpel-conſtitution; for it cannot be God's Language by the Law or Covenant given to innocent *Adam*, which ſaith nothing of it, nor could ſay any thing of it conſiſtently with it ſelf. That this *Will of Chriſt*, thus commanding, promiſing, and threatning, is the *Goſpel Law*, I have elſewhere proved: And a very fit Inſtrument of Government it is, over fallen Man under *offers of mercy*; becauſe here's a Rule ſet for invited

SECT. I. Sinners, to be *judged by Chriſt*, and to *try themſelves*, and they are excited to holy *diligence*, by what affects men's warranted *hopes* and *fears*.

3. WITHOUT the Goſpel-Law, as an Inſtrument of Government over fallen Man, Chriſt could not without reſpect of perſons *judge invited Sinners*, as accepters or refuſers of his tendered benefits; nor could Men upon Self-examination *judge of their preſent State*, whether ſtill condemned, or ſaved from wrath. Not to mention, how Deſpair or Preſumption muſt abate men's *diligence*, when no promiſe is made to any Graces, or Duty, ſhort of that ſinleſs Perfection, which was become impoſſible to fallen men. For,

(1.) WITHOUT a Goſpel-Law, how could Chriſt *judge invited Sinners*, as accepters or refuſers of his offered Pardon? An offer hath been made to many who ſhall then be *condemned*, as well as to the ſaved; and to prevent *a reſpect of perſons* among theſe, the Accepters of this Pardon muſt have more title to Salvation than the Non-accepters. Say not, *Chriſt condemns them by* Adam's *Law, as Sinners:* For Pardon was offered to them, when they were Sinners condemned by that Law; and the *accepters* are by the ſame Law as juſtly condemnable as themſelves, but that the offered Pardon is *given* to thoſe accepters, which is *denied* to theſe who did not accept of it; yea,

yea, God ſaith, it's denied to them becauſe of their Non-acceptance. SECT. I.

IF you object, *Chriſt died for the acceptors of Salvation, and therefore he then ſolemnly adjudgeth them to life: but he died not for thoſe whom he then condemns.* I anſwer, This would make the matter in iſſue at the Judgment-bar to be, Whom did *Chriſt die for*, and for whom did he *not die?* and not, Who accepted or refuſed his offered Salvation? A ſtrange notion of any judicial proceeding at that day; and contrary to every deſcription the Scriptures give of the laſt Judgment. See 2 *Theſ.* i. 7, &c. and *Mat.* xxv. 21, &c. But I aſk, If Chriſt *died not at all* for any then condemned, how came Salvation, which is the effect of Chriſt's death, to be *offered* to them? If you ſay, *It was not offered to them*, tho' living under the external Call of the Goſpel; it's a giving the lye to the plaineſt Scriptures: *Mat.* xxii. 3, 9. *Act.* xiii. 38. And can you tell, how they are ſaid to *neglect Salvation*, and to *put it from them*; Act. xiii. 46. to be *condemned*, becauſe *they believed not*; John iii. 18. yea, and to be *more ſorely puniſhed* for refuſing Salvation? And again,

(2.) No man without this Goſpel-Law could be *aſſured*, whether he be at *preſent* in a State of *Salvation* or *Condemnation*. By *Adam*'s Law, the beſt will ſee himſelf condemnable as imperfect. And if there be no promiſe of Salvation to Faith, the *believer*

SECT. I.

liever muſt ſay, "I may be condemned, "tho' I know I have true Faith:" And if Salvation be not by the promiſe confined to the believer, and the unbeliever excluded by the threatning, the *unbeliever* may ſay, "I "may (as I am) be delivered from wrath, "tho' I am ſure I have not Faith." By which it's plain, Aſſurance is impoſſible; offers of life to any beſides them who will be eventually ſaved, and even a final Judgment, muſt be denied, if there be not a Goſpel-Law. Now therefore,

4. THIS Acceptance of the offered Salvation, being the *performed condition* of the Goſpel-Law, is fitly called *a Goſpel-righteouſneſs*, and is ſo at the Redeemer's bar. *Faith* (as the Apoſtle ſaith) *is imputed for righteouſneſs*; and its *Sincerity* is inſtanced in ſincere obedience, which is called *righteouſneſs* generally in the Word of God, even when it is ſhort of perfect obedience.

Rom. iv. 9, 22.

SHOULD it be ſaid, *Acceptance is naturally neceſſary, to make any offered benefit to become ours.* I anſwer, That if this were true, (which it is not,) yet that doth not here exclude the *inſtituted* place and uſe of it as a *condition*, eſpecially when it is a *moral* Acceptance. The offer is made, to *incline* us to this Acceptance; and final *non-acceptance* is not only a threatned *bar* to our obtaining the offered Salvation, but a *Cauſe* of greater puniſhment: Yea, and *every ſort* of Acceptance will not ſerve, but

but it muſt be according to what's appointed by Chriſt in his *conditional offer*. I aſk, Will a proud contemptuous Acceptance, from a mind reſolved to abuſe the blood of Chriſt as an encouragement to rebellion, avail a ſinner to Salvation? And yet men may be *content* to enjoy, and be *perſuaded* they have Chriſt for pardon and glory, in this very manner. SECT. I.

AGAIN, if it be argued, *This Acceptance, tho' extended to the Rule the promiſe limiteth its offer by, is not ſinleſs obedience, nor perfect; and therefore is not any righteouſneſs.* I anſwer, (1.) That this prejudiceth not; for it is not to *merit* any thing, nor to be a *ſatisfaction* to Juſtice, or *atonement* for ſin, but only to be a *condition* of applying to us *by gift*, what Chriſt merited by his perfect righteouſneſs, and ſupports by his right. And, (2.) If it were ſinleſs obedience, it would be inconſiſtent with our Salvation's being by the merits of a *Redeemer*; and it is in the *virtue* of his righteouſneſs that *Faith* is an accepted *condition*; and being a *condition*, it is *a righteouſneſs* as to judicial proceedings, by that Law which appointeth that condition.

AND if it be ſtill ſaid, *This is too low a thing, to be accepted by Chriſt as a condition.* I anſwer, (1.) It is what *he* is pleaſed to appoint; and not unfitly: For it is *his own gift*; it's a great inſtance of *Divine power*, conſidering the *depraved* ſtate

SECT. I.

ſtate of fallen man; and this, which in his addreſs to men he fixeth to be a *condition*, is what in the Covenant of Redemption did deſcribe ſuch Sinners as ſhould be ſaved in his right. Further, This will reach the end of his *acquired Government* over fallen man; it's the ſeed and principle of *Perfection*; and thereby we are *juſtified by the Spirit of God*, and indebted to *him* as well as to the Father and the Son for our Salvation. But, (2.) Seeing that Chriſt addreſſeth himſelf to Sinners by general Offers of pardon and final glory, and judgeth them as theſe Offers are entertained, it follows, That as there muſt be ſome *diſcriminating condition*, or all the invited ſhould be ſaved; ſo that condition muſt be either *ſinleſs Perfection*, (by which all would be condemned as refuſers;) or *ſincere Acceptance*, as the Offer determineth, *viz.* the Faith of a penitent heart, in due time working by Love, and producing ſincere Obedience, (which is what I inſiſt on;) or it muſt be *impenitent Infidelity*; and then the Offer muſt run thus, "Oh "fallen Sinners, If you will deſpiſe my "Grace, reject my Scepter, abuſe my "Blood, and refuſe to turn to God by "me, and nevertheleſs conclude I am yours, "you ſhall be pardoned and ſaved by my "merits." Now would this become Chriſt's mouth, or tend to recover fallen man, better than this following Offer, *viz.* "Oh "Sinner,

1 Cor. vi. 11.

" Sinner, repent of thy ſins, and credit, SECT.
" receive, and rely on me as thy Prophet, I.
" Prieſt, and King, and thou ſhalt be
" pardoned, and eternally glorified, for
" the ſake of my merits."

WHEN ſome men ſay, *We muſt come to Chriſt as Sinners*, in oppoſition to ſuch who contend for this *laſt Offer*, they muſt intend the Goſpel-offer to be upon the terms of *Impenitency and Infidelity*. For if they meant by *coming to Chriſt*, a true Goſpel-acceptance of Chriſt, then no man can be ſaid to come to Chriſt as an impenitent unbelieving Sinner, tho' a Sinner; for his *coming* is his *penitent believing*. And if they mean by *as Sinners*, that we muſt accept of and rely on Chriſt for Pardon as *guilty* Sinners, and for Sanctification as *impure* Sinners, and that we bring nothing with us to Chriſt that meriteth or makes amends, they *abuſe us* in ſaying we diſagree with them. But yet we abhor their notions, who intend by *coming to Chriſt as Sinners*, that the impenitent Infidel may *perſuade* himſelf that Chriſt is his; and that we ſhall obtain Pardon *no more* upon Repentance and Faith, than if we be impenitent Infidels; which is a diſbelief of the Goſpel, and giving Chriſt the Lye. But further,

5. JUSTIFICATION being a *forenſic* act, that upon which *the Law a man is tried by* doth *acquit* him from its threat-

ned

SECT. I. ned penalty, and entitle him to its promiſed benefits, is ſo far a *juſtifying righteouſneſs* by that Law. The caſe is not altered, by the Law being a *Law of Grace*: For upon a man's *reading*, he is to be acquitted by the Law that allows *benefit of Clergy*, tho' he be condemnable by that Law which makes Felony capital; and there the Iſſue is not, Is he a *Felon?* but did he *read*, or no? and conſequently, is he to die, or no? Laws concerning *Teſtamentary Gifts* do found a Claim upon the *conditions* appointed by the Teſtator, tho' never ſo *undeſerving* in themſelves. By theſe the trial is not, What *proportion* the condition beareth to the value of the Legacy? But is that condition performed, which the Teſtator appointed? And thus,

6. THE cauſe depending as to the *Redeemer's Bar*, and to be tried by the *Goſpel-Law*, is this; Is this man a true believer and accepter of the Pardon and Salvation offered by Chriſt? and conſequently, one whom the *Promiſe* entitles by gift to Pardon and Salvation *in Chriſt's right*, and to Chriſt's Obedience for the ſecuring of it? Or is he an unbeliever and rejecter of Salvation? and conſequently, notwithſtanding Goſpel-offers, abides under the Sentence of the Law of works, and is condemned by the Goſpel to *ſorer puniſhments*, as well as excluded from the offered Salvation? In order to the judicial *deciding* this matter,

the

the hearts and ways of men give evidence, and the Judge that knoweth all things doth juſtify one as a believer, and condemn another as an unbeliever. The Goſpel did not denounce Death againſt, but promiſed Pardon and Life to all true believers; and therefore Chriſt judging by this Goſpel proceeds upon the truth of their Faith, notwithſtanding their conſiſtent Imperfections, and that it is not a Righteouſneſs that would juſtify them by the Sanction of *Adam*'s Law. That legal *perfect Righteouſneſs*, this Goſpel-Law enjoineth not *as a condition*, but ſuppoſeth it performed by Chriſt, *before* he made this offer. And therefore Faith is not a Righteouſneſs *ſubordinate to Chriſt's Righteouſneſs*, in ſuch a ſenſe; as if Chriſt's Righteouſneſs were *not of it ſelf* a ſufficient juſtifying Righteouſneſs to ſatisfy Juſtice, merit Glory, and ſecure a believer's poſſeſſion of eternal Life: But the ſenſe is, that the Goſpel-Law which appoints Faith to be a *condition*, is a Law ſubordinate to the Law of mediation; ſo that upon performance of this *condition*, the Sinner dependently on Chriſt's right, becomes perſonally entitled to Chriſt's righteouſneſs, as his ſecurity for enjoying thoſe ſaving effects which it purchaſed for him according to the Law of mediation, and which are promiſed to himſelf by the Goſpel-Law. And therefore the *Righteouſneſs of Faith*, is ſo far from contributing any

SECT. I.

SECT. I. any thing to Chriſt's merits or ſatisfaction to Juſtice, that it is it ſelf accepted and ſecured at God's bar by the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, which alone, and fully, anſwered the ends of *Adam*'s Law. And hence,

7. THE Promiſes of the Goſpel-Law have ſuch a reſpect to what *Chriſt* did and ſuffered purſuant to the Law of mediation, to procure the Pardon and Salvation which the Goſpel promiſeth to believers, that they all lead us to acknowledge and rely on *his Righteouſneſs*, as what procured the promiſed Pardon and Salvation, and what is imputed to us to ſecure us againſt the Challenge of Juſtice, and the Law, to which our defects, guilt, and forfeitures would otherwiſe ſubject us, notwithſtanding our Faith. But ſtill,

8. JUSTIFICATION by the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, and Juſtification by the *Righteouſneſs of Faith*, are in the Goſpel ſo connected, mutually connoted, and inſeparable in their Subject, that they are expreſſed as if but one only Act; and yet, they are very diſtinguiſhable.

THERE is no Juſtification of our perſons by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs *without Faith*; for by the Covenant of Redemption, it was promiſed to Chriſt for none but ſuch as ſhould believe, and for all ſuch; and by the Conſtitution of the Goſpel it is promiſed to all believers, and *Faith* made a *condition* of our perſonal intereſt in Chriſt's

Christ's Righteousness for Justification unto life. It follows then, that all who are justified by Christ's Righteousness, are also reckoned and adjudged to be believers, and so far justified by the Righteousness of Faith. Again, it follows, from the Nature of the thing, and the Covenant of Redemption, with the reference of the Gospel-promises to that; that there could be no Justification by Faith *unto Salvation before God*, without the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, and Justification thereby. For the *Righteousness of Faith* is not that Righteousness, which God hath accepted for *satisfaction* to his Justice, or to *merit* that right to impunity and life, which the Gospel promiseth: No, that is only *Christ's Righteousness*, and without that, there *had not been* a Pardon and Life to be promised to Sinners by the Gospel. Hence it is plain, that no man justified by the Righteousness of Faith, could be justified *unto Salvation before God*, but as he is justified by Christ's Righteousness, as what pleads with God for him. SECT. I.

BUT tho' they be thus connoted and joined, yet Justification by Christ's Righteousness is *very distinguishable* from Justification by the Righteousness of Faith. In *that*, there's a judicial regard to the Honour of the *original Law*, and the Demands of Justice: In *this*, there is a judicial regard to the Law, by which Christ

SECT. I.

dispenseth his purchased Salvation to Sinners. In *that*, Christ is our *Advocate*; in *this*, our *Judge*. In *that*, the Reward promised to Christ *as a debt* is distributed, and we are justified *in his right*: In *this*, the Benefits are *of gift* to us, and we are justified *freely*, though in a way of *governing Grace*. In *that*, men are considered only as *described by Faith*, they being incapable of performing the condition of the Law of mediation, and so Faith can be no part of our justifying Righteousness there: In *this*, we are the performers of the condition, and are adjudged such. In *that*, we are defended against the Challenge of Divine Justice, and *Adam*'s Law, and warranted in our enjoying the great things the Gospel promiseth to believers, tho' imperfect: In *this*, we are acquitted from the guilt of final rejection of the Gospel-offers, and declared heirs of its promises, by free adoption.

THE Difference is so great, that what's equivalent to a twofold Justification of a believer, is implied, where but one is expressed; *viz.* Justification *by the Blood of Christ*, as that where his alone Righteousness is proceeded on *as a Righteousness*; and Justification *by Faith*, where Faith hath the place of a Righteousness *as a performed condition*; tho' the other is connoted *as the Merit*, for which there is upon believing, a Justification unto life. And thus

thus Christ's Righteousness doth as it were *justify* our Justification by Faith, as it vindicates God's Justice, honours the Law, and supports our Pardon and Gospel-Title. SECT. L.

By this account there is a Harmony between the Covenant of Redemption, and the Gospel-Covenant. By *that*, there is provided the Righteousness of Christ *without us*, in which the pardoned believer stands safe at the Bar of a *just Creator*, where Christ's atonement, satisfaction, and merit, plead for his acquittal, and right to Glory, as no way injurious to Justice: And by *this*, the Righteousness is adjusted, that at the Redeemer's Bar distinguisheth the Sinner who shall be acquitted upon Christ's satisfaction, from the Sinner whom he will not have to be acquitted thereby. And thus,

9. THIS Gospel-righteousness is *no way dishonourable* to Christ's righteousness; for it is no way a Rival with it, seeing it is not to merit, or to satisfy Justice, or make amends for Sin, which are *Christ's* peculiars: Nay, it is what was not suitable to Christ to perform *in his own Person*, because he it is who requires it as Lawgiver, from those who are brought into his own Kingdom as Mediator, to discriminate them from such as will be judicially denied the Salvation he offered them, and as what serves the purposes of his *Mediatorial*

SECT. I. Kingdom: And to deny it, is to deny the Mediator any Kingdom, except one *merely Phyſical*; unleſs to be Rebels, or Subjects, is the ſame under his adminiſtration.

Obj. VI. *He aſſerts, that forgiving, adopting, glorifying, and conveying of every promiſed Benefit, are judicial Acts of God, as Rector, in a way of diſtribution of Rewards.* Pref. *pag.* xi. xii. Book, *pag.* 142, 148.

Anſw. I DENY it of *the firſt Grace*, and expreſs it only concerning Promiſes made to Graces. And I deny the Benefits to be a reward *of debt*, but affirm them to be given in a way of reward, but that *of Grace*. Pag. 68, 137.

THE *Difference is*, Whether Chriſt gives his ſaving Benefits as a Ruler, encouraging men to perform any duty, to which he moves them by his promiſe of thoſe Benefits? This I affirm with Dr. *Twiſs*; and they deny, as if they never read of Rewards in the Goſpel, and thought Chriſt no Governor or Judge. But the laſt Head ſpares further Labour.

Obj. VII. *He perverts and wreſts many eminent portions of Scripture; in particular*, Phil. iii. 8, 9. *pag.* 220. Iſa. lxiv. 6. *pag.* 219. Jer. xxxi. 33. *and* Heb. viii. 10. *pag.* 74, 75.

Anſw. SEE the places, and you'll find, that

that on *Phil.* iii. 8, 9. I do aſſert, that Chriſt's imputed righteouſneſs is intended there; tho' I add, that Goſpel-righteouſneſs is intended alſo, as the effect of it, and could not there be oppoſed to it. And I find, ſo did St. *Auguſtin* of old, and of late the Reverend Mr. *Cradock*, and others. *Calvin* gives the ſame ſenſe of *Iſa.* lxiv. 6. as I do. But I find none can confute my expoſition of any of theſe texts: And no human Authority ſhall ſway me, againſt the plain meaning of the Holy Ghoſt. SECT. I.

THUS I have anſwered all theſe Reverend Brethren's exceptions, which have led me to enlarge on what I never deſigned to trouble the world with. For my buſineſs lay againſt *Juſtification without Faith*; *God's ſeeing no Sin in Believers*; *Sin could do them no hurt, nor Duty do them any good*; *Believers ſhould not mourn for Sin*; and the like impious aſſertions of Dr. *Criſp*. What in their *printed* (and more in their *written*) *Paper* would *expoſe* them, I meddle not with: If I can undeceive them, or others miſsled by them, in their accuſations of this Book, I am content to bear their cenſures as raſh, and paſs by other things as weak. Mr. *Chauncy* repeats theſe Objections in a ſeeming Anſwer to this Book; but is ſo unhappy as to miſrepreſent my Judgment in moſt particulars, which you may ſee in *Sect.* 1. of my *Defence of Goſpel-Truth*.

SECT. I.

Truth. And he ſo much agrees in all other things with Dr. *Criſp*, that my State of the difference between Dr. *Criſp* and me will ſave further labour in ſtating it with Mr. *Chauncy*.

As for Mr. *Criſp*, I leave him to get an *underſtanding of what he affirms*, before I dare waſte any precious time to expoſe his Impertinencies, his Self-contradictions, and ſcandalous Falſhoods. There be others of his degree in intellectuals, who dare be Authors in this controverſy, becauſe their Weakneſs will ſecure them from any Anſwer.

SECT. II.

A Reply to Mr. Lobb's *Objections.*

SECT. II.

LONG after two Editions of this Book, Mr. *Lobb* ſo acquitted it in print, as to adventure to tell the world, there was no difference between Mr. *Chauncy* and me. Yet when he thought it ſeaſonable for his other purpoſes, he alſo turns an Objector; but waveth the former exceptions, (except the firſt and ſeventh,) that his deſign of dividing the *united Preſbyterians* might the better ſucceed: And he addeth theſe following Objections, which I ſhall now but briefly inſiſt on, becauſe

becauſe I have by me an Anſwer to his *Appeal*, the publication whereof is delayed by the long and to be lamented Sickneſs of that ornament of our nation, *the Biſhop of Worceſter.* SECT. II.

Obj. I. *The Father was not diſpleaſed with Chriſt.* Goſpel-Truth, *pag.* 34.

Anſw. THE *Difference is not*, Whether Chriſt endured the effects of God's wrath againſt ſin; and that God teſtified his threatened indignation againſt ſin, in the awful Sufferings of Chriſt in ſoul and body? This I affirm in that very place.

THE *Difference is*, Whether God was *diſpleaſed with Chriſt*, (as diſpliceney is oppoſed to *complacential Love,*) and this *becauſe of the filthineſs of ſin* upon him? This I deny; and Mr. *Lobb* affirms, and conſequently, that Chriſt was *hated* and *abhorred* by the Father, and that *for the filthineſs of ſin upon him*; for theſe laſt words I joined with *diſpleaſed*, tho' he leaves them out after his uſual manner.

Obj. II. *All Communications of comfort* [*or ſtrength*] *from the Divine Nature, could not be interrupted while the Union remained.* Pag. 37.

Anſw. THE *Difference is not*, Whether the Divine Nature ſuſpended for a while the delightful Communications of itſelf, as to the degrees it was accuſtomed to emit

SECT. II. to the Human Nature of Chriſt? This I even there affirm.

THE *Difference is*, Whether ſuch degrees of comfort were ſuſpended, as were neceſſary to ſupport the holy truſt, hope, and ſtrength of Chriſt, and to ſecure his patience, and peace of conſcience as to his own Innocency, and to prevent deſpair? This I deny, and Mr. *Lobb* affirms.

Obj. III. *There is not a Change of Perſon between Chriſt and the Elect, nor between him and believers.* Pag. 41, 45.

Anſw. THE *Difference is not*, (1.) Whether Chriſt died properly *in our ſtead?* This I ſtill affirm, *pag.* 41, 43, 47, 48. Nor, (2.) Whether what our Divines mean by a *Commutation of Perſons*, be true in oppoſition to the *Socinians?* viz. That whereas Sinners were obnoxious to ſuffer the Puniſhments due to their ſins, the Lord Jeſus became our mediating Surety, and as ſuch, our Puniſhments were judicially transferred on him; which for our Redemption, according to his engagement, he endured *in our room and ſtead*, to the Satisfaction of Juſtice, that we might be juſtified when we believe? This I conſtantly affirm, *pag.* 8, 10, 11, 15, 43, 270. Nor did I deny any part of this, by any argument I urged againſt that *Change of Perſon*, which I denied. See *pag.* 45, *Letter to Mr.* Humfrey, *pag.* 293,

293. and *Anſwer to the Report*, *pag.* 374, to 379. SECT. II.

Mr. *Lobb* made uſe of the Writings of the Right Reverend the *Biſhop of Worceſter*, and the Reverend Dr. *Edwards*, againſt me in this point: But they were pleaſed to vindicate me fully in their *Letters* to me, which I publiſhed in the *Anſwer to the Report*, *pag.* 411, 424. The *united Miniſters* alſo did the ſame, and among them ſuch Subſcribers to this Book, as before that had ſigned what is called *the Firſt Paper*. [Mr. *Burgeſs*, I am contented to except, tho' he agreed to *the Third Paper*.] See *Anſwer to the Report*, *pag.* 339, 374, 377, 379, 383.

THE *Difference is*, Whether there be ſuch a *Change of Perſon* between Chriſt and the Elect or Believers, as makes Chriſt to be *as ſinful as them*, and them to be *as righteous as Chriſt?* This is the *Change of Perſon*, which in oppoſition to Dr. *Criſp* I denied, and Mr. *Lobb* muſt affirm; or he objects in this and the laſt point, for worſe ends than to detect an Error. See more in the next Head, where I ſhall handle what refers to both theſe Objections together.

Obj. IV. *It is Blaſphemy to debaſe Chriſt among Tranſgreſſors.* Pag. 46.

Anſw. MY words are, "It is Blaſphe-"my to debaſe him among their number, "who

SECT. II. "who were Enemies, without ſtrength, "and Sinners, for whom he was *the dy-* "*ing Sacrifice.*" And theſe words are brought only to prove, that Chriſt was not *as ſinful* as we; which you ſee cannot paſs with Mr. *Lobb*, becauſe he is for no lower *Change of Perſons*, than what will make Chriſt to be *a Sinner*. But this being the hinge of the Controverſy the politick Mr. *Lobb* hath ſtarted to revive our diviſions, I ſhall ſet the Difference in a plain light.

THE *Difference is not*, (1.) Whether Chriſt did bear *the puniſhment* of our ſins? Nor, (2.) Whether he did bear *the guilt* of our ſins? that is, was by his own conſent *obliged* to bear the puniſhment due to us for ſin? Nor, (3.) Whether Chriſt was eſteemed *by men* a Tranſgreſſor, and crucified between two thieves? Nor, (4.) Whether Chriſt was made *under the Law*, and (conſidered as a man,) was obliged to *obey* its precepts, and was for his obedience entitled to its reward? Nor, (5.) Whether the *penal Sanction* of the violated Law againſt us Sinners, and the Juſtice of God, and the Honour of Divine Government, made it requiſite, that if Sinners ſhould be pardoned for the ſake of a ſatisfying Mediator, *Death* threatned by the Law *for ſin*, ſhould be inflicted on that Mediator? Nor, (6.) Whether Chriſt in the Covenant of Redemption obliged himſelf

himſelf to *obey* the Law, and to *ſuffer* Death for our ſins; and this, to ſatisfy Juſtice, to honour the Law by anſwering its ends, to make Atonement for Iniquity, to procure Peace, to be a proper Ranſom for ſinners, to merit eternal Life, to purchaſe the Goſpel-grant, to expreſs God's Hatred againſt ſin, and to be a warning againſt all Diſobedience, as what nothing below his Blood could expiate? Nor, (7.) Whether the *Father* conſented to this his undertaking, and approved of what he engaged, to be the *Condition* of our redemption and reconciliation; ſubſtituting him to ſuffer in Sinners ſtead, with a Promiſe to him, of Pardon and eternal Life for all that ſhould believe on him, and of a certain Number who ſhould believe and for ever glorify him? Nor, (8.) Whether Chriſt being thus by his own and the Father's conſent a *mediating Surety*, did *die in our ſtead*, that we might *not die* but live; and the Father juſtly inflicted Death on Chriſt, thus obliged to endure it as the puniſhment of our ſin, on him as the propitiatory Sacrifice; and that Chriſt ſo far *ſuſtained the Perſon of Sinners*, and was dealt with as if he had been a Sinner? Nor, (9.) Whether God did eſteem Chriſt and Sinners to be *ſo far* one Legal Perſon when he died; as a ſinleſs Perſon that freely and without their Concurrence engageth to redeem Sinners by dying in their

SECT. II.

SECT. II. their ſtead, and they in whoſe ſtead he ſo dieth, are one; and that in this ſenſe he was *our Repreſentative?* Nor, (10.) Whether God accounted and adjudged Chriſt's Sufferings to be *in Sinners ſtead*, and thereby their Crimes to be expiated; ſo that God can demand *no other Atonement* from any who believe on Chriſt; and that his Sufferings are as effectual, to *put away Sin*, as if (and infinitely more than if) the Filth of Sin had been tranſacted on him, and to ſave believing Sinners, as if God had legally eſteemed *them* to have ſuffered, and *Chriſt* to be a Sinner? Nor, (11.) Whether our Sins were the *meritorious cauſe* of Chriſt's Death, and not only the *final cauſe?* that is, Chriſt did not only die to incline and encourage us to repent of our Sins, that upon our Repentance we might be pardoned: But our committed Sins, (ſtill ours, *not his*, further than to expiate them,) being meritorious of our Death, and he obliging himſelf to redeem us by a Satisfaction, and *by his Death* to propitiate God, who was ſo injured and ſo provoked by our Sins, that *without Blood* there ſhould be *no Remiſſion*; it follows, That tho' Chriſt deſerved not to die for our Sins as a *Criminal*, yet our Sins which deſerved our Death, did deſerve the Death of him who would ſave us from dying, by making reparation for our Sins thereby; and Chriſt making that repara-

Heb. ix. 22.

reparation by dying for our Sins to ſave us, *our Sins* may properly be called the *meritorious cauſe* of his Death, *as a Saviour* of us Sinners, tho' not *as a Sinner himſelf*. All theſe I do affirm, and nothing can be found in my Books contrary thereto. See *pag.* 8, 10, 11, 17, 41, 114, 235, 270. *Defence of Goſpel-Truth*, Pref. *pag.* 294, 295, 296. And *Man made righteous*, pag. 12, 18,—22, 50, 68, 105, 109, 128. SECT. II.

THE *real Difference is*, [1.] Whether Chriſt was *a Sinner* in God's eſteem, and a Tranſgreſſor at his bar? This Mr. *Lobb* oft affirms; and ſays, " He was not only " treated *as if he were a Criminal*, but was " a Criminal *in foro poli*." See his *Appeal*, *pag.* 56, *&c.* This I deny; becauſe he muſt be *really a Sinner*, or God could not eſteem him ſuch, for he accounts of things as indeed they are: But he could not be *a Sinner*, unleſs he committed the Sin, or were culpably *acceſſary* to the perpetration of it, or were ſeminally and repreſentatively in ſuch as ſinned, as we were in *Adam*. But to ſay, *Chriſt was a Sinner* in any of theſe reſpects, is downright *Blaſphemy*: Yea, were it only that he was *a Sinner*, upon the account of being *repreſented by us* when we ſinned; for thereby he muſt have ſuffered for *his own Sins*, unleſs you'll deny original Sin to be *our Sin*: Neither could he ſuffer as a Sinner, for any beſides *his own Progenitors*, if he were a Sinner only

SECT. II. only by being *ſeminally* in ſuch as were Tranſgreſſors.

[2.] WHETHER Chriſt and we were ſo *one legal Perſon*, as that we are legally accounted to have obeyed the Law, and to have ſuffered what Chriſt endured? This Mr. *Lobb* affirms, and I deny. For if we ſuffered what he ſuffered, as *one legal Perſon* with him, then we ſuffered as much as was *fit* to make Satisfaction to Juſtice for our ſins; nay, we ſuffered all that was *accepted* by God for Satisfaction: And conſequently, unleſs you'll ſay, that *Chriſt's Sufferings* were not fit nor accepted for Satisfaction, we ſuffering the ſame things, and as one Perſon, have as well *ſatisfied* in Chriſt, as we ſuffered in him; which is a proud and vile aſſumption, making Chriſt to waſh us from ſin *in our own legal Blood*, if his legal Blood doth waſh us; and ſets us up to claim Life *of debt*, if Chriſt had ſuch a claim; and implies, that Chriſt was pardoned, or we have no need of Pardon. More might be ſaid, againſt our obeying the Law in Chriſt; but I paſs by that.

[3.] WHETHER Chriſt and we were *one joint federating Party* in the Covenant of works, either before it was violated, or after it was violated? that is, Was that Covenant thus conſtituted before the Fall, "If thou *innocent Adam*, or Chriſt thy "Surety, ſhall keep the Law, thou ſhalt "live;

" live; but if thou break the Law, *thou* SECT.
" *or thy Surety ſhall die?*" Or after the II.
Fall was it thus; " If thou *fallen Adam*,
" or Chriſt thy Surety, ſhall endure the
" Curſe, and hereafter keep the Law,
" thou ſhalt live; if not, thou ſhalt abide
" under the Curſe?" Mr. *Lobb* affirms it in the laſt ſenſe. I deny it in both ſenſes, becauſe God's Word ſaith nothing of it, but much inconſiſtent therewith; and it tends to deſtroy the Goſpel and all true Religion. But I paſs by the former ſenſe, and except briefly againſt the latter. If Chriſt and we were *one joint federating Party* in that Covenant after it was violated, then *Adam's* Covenant, after it was violated, was not the ſame Covenant as God made with *Adam* before the Fall: Which might be proved by ſuch reaſons; Chriſt is inſerted a Party in it, and all the Non-elect excluded as no Parties; and *Adam* ceaſed to be a repreſentative of *mankind*, but is made to be a repreſentative of the *Elect*, as ſome ſay, or of *Believers*, as Mr. *Lobb* ſaith: Hereby alſo *Faith in a Mediator*, is made a *condition* of, and by the Covenant of works, *&c.* Nay, it would follow, that *Adam* after he ſinned, and was *condemned* by the Covenant of works, had terms of Life offered to him by that very ſame Covenant which he was condemned by: Which, with a hundred more differencing things, would raiſe a Bluſh

SECT. II. a Bluſh in a modeſt perſon to aſſert, that it was in *Adam's* violated Covenant of works, that Chriſt was a joint Party with us. If Mr. *Lobb* ſhould ſay, That God by this violated Covenant propoſed, and agreed to theſe terms of Life, (*viz.* Chriſt's obedience to the Law, and ſuffering its curſe,) only to and with *Chriſt for Adam*, and not to or with *Adam*: I anſwer, This would make it to be *the Covenant of Redemption*, which one might think would ſet it ſtill further from being *Adam's* Covenant of works, or *the ſame Bond*, as they call it.

[4.] WHETHER Chriſt became *a Surety*, by coming under the Law, as the Inſtrument and adequate Rule of his engagement? This I deny, and Mr. *Lobb* affirms. Or did Chriſt come under the Law, becauſe he was conſtituted *a Surety* by the *Covenant of Redemption*, as the Inſtrument and adequate Rule of his engagements, wherein his coming under the Law was *one Article?* This Mr. *Lobb* denies, and I affirm; becauſe the Law could put no value on the *Dignity* of his Perſon, nor adjuſt his *Reward*; it preſcribed not what was *ſufficient* to be meritorious and ſatisfactory for Sinners, and yet inſiſted on ſome things *inconſiſtent* with Chriſt's condition, as God-Man, *&c.*

[5.] WHETHER was Chriſt as *a ſtrict pecuniary Surety with us?* that is, Was Chriſt jointly

jointly obliged with us *in one Bond* to pay, whereby *we* ſhould be legally accounted to pay if he paid? And as to the demand of the Creditor, (*viz.* God,) are *we* as well as Chriſt, *immediately*, and by that very Bond including us as one legal Perſon, *to be diſcharged*, unleſs Chriſt be undiſcharged? This Mr. *Lobb* affirms, and I deny. Or was Chriſt as *a mediating Surety*, ſelf-obliged to make *Satisfaction* for us *Criminals?* that is, Did Chriſt *as Mediator* oblige himſelf *by a Bond of his own*, to make *Satisfaction* and *merit* benefits for Criminals; reſerving a liberty to *ſuſpend* our perſonal Right to his acquired pardon and benefits, upon *other Terms* than the Bond we were in included? This Mr. *Lobb* denies, and I affirm. And I ſee not how any, who affirm the *former*, and deny this *latter*, can argue againſt *Antinomianiſm*, or preach otherwiſe to a mixt Aſſembly, than thus, "You that are *Elect*, are already juſtified "by the Law of works; no Sin you com- "mit can make you *unrighteous*, nor is "Faith it ſelf needful to put you into a "*ſafe accepted State*; and if you would "know this, *be perſuaded of it*: But you "*Non-elect* have no offers of Salvation, and "Chriſt is not able to ſave you, becauſe he "was not bound with you in the Cove- "nant of works." Nor is it eaſily accounted for, how ſo many can infer, that becauſe Chriſt is once called *a Surety of a* SECT. II.

SECT. II.

better Covenant, which promiſeth *Pardon* (*Heb.* vii. 22.) therefore he is with us a Surety of the Covenant of works, which pronounceth the *Curſe*: Ay, and hereby model their Scheme of Chriſtianity, againſt the plain *Scope* of the Bible, and all the *Sermons* of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, which propoſe benefits on the ſame terms of Duty to all alike.

[6.] WHETHER the meaning of Chriſt's *ſuſtaining the Perſon of Sinners* is, that Chriſt was an adjudged Sinner *in foro poli*, at the bar of God? This Mr. *Lobb* affirms, and I deny. Or is it, that Chriſt ſtill *reputed* the innocent ſinleſs Mediator, mediating for Sinners, ſuffered *in their ſtead* for their Salvation, what they were obliged to ſuffer, and they otherwiſe ſhould have endured? This Mr. *Lobb* denies, and I affirm: For had he not been *reputed ſinleſs* at God's bar, his Sufferings had not availed us: Nor could God eſteem him a Sinner. But of this elſewhere.

[7.] WHETHER by Chriſt's *dying in the Sinner's ſtead* is meant, that *Chriſt* in the Sinner's room, became *the Sinner*; and being legally the Sinner, he as ſuch *died for Believers*, and they in him? This Mr. *Lobb* affirms, and I deny. Or is it, that whereas we who were Sinners were liable and obliged to die, Chriſt the juſt Mediator came into our room *as liable* and obliged *to die*, and ſuffered death to make ſatisfaction

faction for *our ſins*, and ranſom *us* from death? This Mr. *Lobb* denies, and I affirm: And I can eaſily prove it to be the ſenſe of that Phraſe in our Confeſſions of Faith; nor do moſt of our orthodox Authors intend more by it, notwithſtanding the lax Expreſſions of ſome in oppoſition to the *Socinians*; and tho' ſome *Socinians* uſe this Phraſe, yet it is in a very contrary ſenſe to what is here given. SECT. II.

[8.] WAS Chriſt obliged *immediately* by the penal Sanction of *Adam*'s Law to die? that is, Did the Father as Judge paſs Sentence upon Chriſt, addreſſing himſelf to him according to the Curſe of the Law, in this manner? "Thou Chriſt haſt *ſinned*, "therefore thou Chriſt *a Sinner* ſhalt die." This Mr. *Lobb* affirms, and I deny. For the Sanction of that Law *ſuppoſeth* one a Sinner before it lies againſt him, and doth not *make* him a Sinner; the Curſe of the Law can *immediately* oblige none to Puniſhment, that it *finds* not to be a *Tranſgreſſor*; and a man is denominated a Tranſgreſſor from the *Precept* violated, and not from the *penal Sanction*, as Mr. *Lobb* fondly imagineth; whereas the Sanction determineth only, in what *manner* the offender is *puniſhable*.——Or was Chriſt *immediately* obliged to die, by his own Sponſion, and the Right God had thereby over him; but *mediately*, by the penal Sanction of *Adam*'s Law? that is, Is not the Sentence

SECT. II.

to be thus apprehended? "Whereas thou "Chriſt, the Mediator, haſt with my con- "ſent declared *thy willingneſs* to expiate "ſin, and ranſom Sinners juſtly condemn- "ed by the Curſe of my Law *to die*; and "whereas my vindictive *Juſtice*, the ho- "nour of my Law and Government re- "quired, that I the *Rector* ſhould exact "*Satisfaction* to be given, and *Reparation* "made, for the crimes of theſe Sinners, "*by thy Death*, if I agreed to thy redeem- "ing and ſaving them; and thou haſt "*obliged thy ſelf* to die in their ſtead to "redeem them; *therefore thou* the juſt "Mediator, my beloved Son, *ſhalt die* "this ſhameful accurſed Death, and *this* "*Cup muſt not paſs from thee.*" This Mr. *Lobb* denieth, and I affirm. For tho' I conceive the Juſtice of proceeding thus with him, who was *ſui Juris*, and had freely *conſented*; yet I ſee not how the Curſe could *immediately* oblige him to die, who was no Criminal; nor how our ſins could be *imputed to Chriſt* otherwiſe, than as what he had promiſed as Mediator to be an expiatory *Sacrifice* for, which could not make him *a Sinner*, nor be more (but leſs) *effectual*, if God had eſteemed him a Sinner: Nor did God ever *require*, nor Chriſt *promiſe*, that he would become *a Sinner*, or be eſteemed one at God's bar; nor is there any *Act* of the Father, or his own, to found ſuch an Imputation of ſin, as ſhall give

give him the repute of a Sinner *in divine eſteem*. Indeed God, as above the original Law, did according to the Law of *Mediation*, lay upon him *the Iniquities of us all*, yea made them to *meet on him*; that not one of them ſhould be unſatisfied for, by the propitiatory *Sacrifice of him*, who conſented to be dealt with *as if a Sinner*, to ſave ſuch as were ſo. But the Moral Law *of itſelf* laid nothing to his Charge, to render him a filthy or guilty Sinner; and therefore its Curſe did not *immediately* oblige him; nor could it, unleſs you'll ſay, he *perſonally* violated it in its preceptive part, or ſinned *in us* as we fell in *Adam*. God declared *us* Tranſgreſſors, in the *Neceſſity* of his Death to ſave us; but proclaimed him *obedient* to his command *in dying*, and *loved* him; yea, *crowned* him with Glory and Honour *for it*; which were a ſtrange procedure towards one who was a Tranſgreſſor, and *as ſuch*, condemned to die by the *immediate* obligation of the Curſe. SECT. II.

[9.] DID Chriſt ſuffer the *idem*, that is, all the ſame for Kind, which the Law-threatning againſt Sinners included? This Mr. *Lobb* affirms, and I deny, as inconſiſtent with the nature of *Satisfaction*, which is not a *Solution* of all the ſame in Kind. Or did Chriſt ſuffer *ſome* of the ſame things in Kind, and a *full Equivalent* to what he did not ſuffer in Kind? This Mr.

SECT. II.

Lobb denies, and I affirm. I grant, that Chriſt endured bodily Death, inward Terrors, and many other things of the *ſame ſort*, as we were to ſuffer. But (to name no more) I deny, that he endured a *Spiritual Death*. Did he loſe the Image of God, and was he *ſpiritually dead in ſin*, by being deprived of the *Holy Spirit*? or was the *Return* of that Spirit, as to *ſanctifying* operations, *penally* denied him at any time? Yet Mr. *Lobb* will grant this to be included in the Curſe of the Law; and the threatned *Death* in that Curſe is commonly divided into Temporal, *Spiritual*, and Eternal, as three Species thereof. If he *objects*, It was *impoſſible*, Chriſt ſhould die a Spiritual Death: I *anſwer*, If it be true, (as he ſaith,) that *Juſtice* required the whole *idem* to be ſuffered in Kind, tho' not in circumſtances, and that without it Juſtice could not be *ſatisfied*; it follows then, that Chriſt was *not fit* to be a *Redeemer*, becauſe he was not *capable* to bear all for Kind which the *Curſe* included; and by his aſſertion, Chriſt is not a *compleat Redeemer*, becauſe he was not under a Spiritual Death, through the *abſence* of the Holy Spirit. And hence, *Juſtice* is ſtill unſatisfied; with ſeveral ſuch Conſequences, which might be juſtly urged in this caſe *againſt him*; but are ſtrangely argued by him, to prove Chriſt *a Sinner*, (for that's his ſcope,) though he leaves us

in

in the dark how he *became* ſuch, and chimes ſome frightful words backward and forward, which conclude nothing like *his being ſuch*. But in lieu of both, he makes our Chriſtian Cauſe *indefenſible* againſt the *Socinians*, that he may brand us with *Socianiſm* among the ignorant. For, SECT. II.

(1.) By his Scheme we muſt yield up Chriſt's Prieſtly Office, and the doctrine of his Satisfaction, unleſs we can prove, that *Chriſt* was *a Tranſgreſſor* by being *one* political or legal *Perſon* with apoſtate *Sinners*, and thoſe Sinners one legal Perſon with Chriſt *the Sufferer*; a Point, I think, by himſelf too much expoſed. For if from that Union he juſtly infers, that *we ſuffered in Chriſt*, how will it be avoided that *Chriſt alſo ſinned in us*? (for the Union is mutual:) And Chriſt *the Sinner* muſt be *pardoned* notwithſtanding his Satisfaction, or we be *above the need of Pardon* through our ſuffering *that* in him, which was *accepted* for Satisfaction. If you'll ſay, the Satisfaction was *refuſable*; I anſwer, It was refuſable from *Chriſt*, *antecedently* to the Compact; and not refuſable from *us* in him, *after* that Compact.

(2.) By his Sentence they are all *Socinians*, who allow not *Chriſt* to be *a Sinner*, tho' they acknowledge, as I do, That there was a *Change of Perſons* between Chriſt and us, as to our *puniſhments*, tho' not otherwiſe as to our *ſins*, than to bear

SECT. II. them, as he was a well-pleaſing *Sacrifice*, but not as a hateful *Sinner*: That Chriſt died *properly* in our ſtead, tho' he was not *a Sinner* in our ſtead; and that Chriſt's Sufferings, as to the *end* of God's inflicting them, and of his enduring them, were *proper* puniſhments, tho' *vicarious*; that is, they were not *inſtead* of puniſhments, but *real* puniſhments; yet were endured by our ſelf-obliged Mediator, *inſtead* of the Sinners who did deſerve them: That he died to ſatisfy *vindictive Juſtice*; yet that was provoked, not by *him* the Redeemer, but by *us* Sinners, whom *he* engaged to redeem: And that our Sins were the *meritorious cauſe* of his death, as what muſt be expiated by the death of *him* who *would* releaſe Sinners from death in a way of Satisfaction, and who engaged to do ſo by his dying in their ſtead; yet they were *our ſins*, and not *his ſins*, which deſerved death; and but for the neceſſity of *death* to ſatisfy Juſtice, and Chriſt's Reſolution and Engagement to ſave Sinners even by *his own dying* to make Satisfaction, he no more deſerved to die for our ſins, than *our ſins* deſerved he ſhould ſo reſolve and engage to ſave us by dying in our ſtead.

THESE Conceſſions, and many more of this kind, ought as well to reſtrain Mr. *Lobb*'s unjuſt outcries againſt me, as they compelled him, for want of matter in my Books, to muſter up a few expreſſions of

Mr.

Mr. *Baxter*'s, which he perverts to a quite contrary ſenſe than they were deſigned by that excellent and upright Author. His argument from them againſt me, deſerves rather Pity than an Anſwer: For hopeth he to induce any man to think, That every obnoxious expreſſion of Mr. *Baxter* muſt declare *my ſenſe*, who never uſed ſuch expreſſions, but thoſe ſo very different, that unbounded Craft, excited by inveterate malice, as well as vigorouſly deſigned projects, cannot wreſt them to obnoxiouſneſs? Nevertheleſs I ſhall (if that eaſy Labour be not prevented by others,) plainly evidence Mr. *Lobb* to be very ignorant what *Socinianiſm* is, or extremely injurious to Mr. *Baxter*, in charging him therewith; whereas his very objected expreſſions are intended only to *diſtinguiſh* (over acurately) between a *Sponſor*'s ſuffering for the ſins of *others*, and the *delinquent*'s ſuffering for *his own* ſins; and being allowed for this, Mr. *Baxter* fully aſſerts the orthodox Doctrine of Chriſt's Satisfaction againſt the *Socinians*. But what can Mr. *Lobb* ſcruple, to give a wound to that reverend Name? who repreſents him ſaying, "Our Sins were only "a *mere occaſion* of Chriſt's death *after* his "Sponſion," becauſe *before* that Sponſion they could be no other than ſo.

SECT. II.

SECT.

SECT. III.

A Vindication from ſome Aſperſions, with a brief Summary of my Principles.

SECT. III.

HAVING anſwered the exceptions againſt the *matter* of this Book, it's at laſt become neceſſary, I ſhould clear my ſelf from the *Aſperſions* publiſhed in ſome late nameleſs Pamphlets. It's known to very many, how eaſy it were to wipe off all thoſe Reproaches. But I fear, the doing it as effectually as I am capable, ſhould give ſo much a greater wound to *Religion* than my Reputation would countervail, that I heartily pray, I may never be forced to expoſe ſo many perſons, and to diſcover ſuch methods, as that would neceſſitate me to. Reſolved therefore to prefer a *publick* good, and to proceed to no higher degrees than as I'm compelled; I ſhall content my ſelf with this ſhort *Vindication*, even as to what they ſay of that affair, which I referred to the *united Miniſters* about three Years and nine Months ſince.

IF I had met with any perſon accuſing me of Whoredom, Cheating, or any Crime that could bear an Action at *Common Law*; I had

I had not deſired the *united Miniſters* to put themſelves to the trouble of receiving and judging of whatever could be objected againſt my Converſation: Nor did I fear an enquiry into my Life, when I agreed to have ſeveral of the *Committee* to report matter of Fact to the Body of Miniſters, from whom Juſtice was the utmoſt I could expect, ſeeing it was not very long after the Breach at *Pinners-Hall*. The Perſons appointed were Dr. *Anneſley*, Mr. *Griffith*, Mr. *Hammond*, Mr. *Barker*, Mr. *Bragg*, Mr. *Mayo*, Mr. *Howe*, Mr. *Alſop*, Mr. *Stretton*, and Mr. *William Taylor*. [Dr. *Bates* was alſo named, but could not meet with them except about twice; yet he ſoon ſaw enough for my Vindication.] Mr. *Lobb* met ſtill with them, at the deſire of ſome of the *Committee*. They heard all pretenſions; yea, ſpent two Meetings to hear, if I could be proved guilty of having ſpoken any one Untruth: And after about Eight Weeks ſpent in this affair, the Minutes of their Report, written by Mr. *W. Taylor*, were by them ordered to be given in by him to the *united Miniſters*. In which Report it is declared, that all the forenamed Perſons being preſent, (except Dr. *Bates*,) they were agreed, concerning each of the things attempted to be made good againſt me, that there was *no Proof*, that I was guilty of any one of them. Only at the end of the Report a Note is added, as a Minute of

SECT. III.

April

SECT. III.

April 8. (being the morning before the Report was delivered, and three of the above-named not preſent,) which ſeems to inſinuate ſomewhat towards two Faults, after they had cleared me as to all other mentioned inſtances. Their inſinuation is in theſe words, " As to the practice of " having his Side chafed by the hands of " a Woman, by which Offence hath been " occaſioned; it is ſuch an indecent Act " as the Seventh Commandment warns " againſt, for which he hath expreſſed his " ſorrow: And whereas it was charged " on Mr. *Williams*, that he had denied his " arreſting Mr. *Wheeler*, which denial he " profeſſeth he remembers not, it was " teſtified againſt him by Mr. *Kuffin* and " his Wife:" Of both which you'll preſently ſee the Brethren's account.

I HAVE Reaſon to adore the Providence of God, which fully detected the groundleſſneſs of ſuch Teſtimonies as pretend only mere ſilly *Suſpicion*, and that contradicted all the *hearſays* by the Teſtimony of their firſt pretended Authors. I'll give one inſtance: Mr. *Kuffin* told the Miniſters, " that " his Wife told him, her Maid told her, that " my Maid told her, that upon her telling " me ſomewhat of him, I aſked her a fooliſh " Queſtion concerning him." But my Maid, inſtead of affirming it, took a ſolemn Oath before a Maſter in Chancery, that I never aſked her that, or any ſuch Queſtion, *&c.* which

which Oath was produced: What followed that Queſtion, I paſs by. And how amazing was it, that God ſo over-ruled all their Witneſſes, as that not one of them could ſo much as pretend, that ever they themſelves heard from me one indecent word, or knew by me one obſcene geſture or action; except Mrs. *Martin* the Nurſe, (called *Lathwood* when in *Ireland*,) the Miniſters enſuing Character of whom was proved by the Atteſtations and Oaths of Fifteen Perſons of good reputation and unſuſpected piety: (Yet *Wheeler* was as fully proved, even more faulty then her.) SECT. III.

THE *united Miniſters* met together, to the number of near Sixty, *April* 8, 1695. upon general notice given them, that the Report would be delivered in that Day for their Determination; and after much diſcourſe and enquiries, they gave their Judgment by this *Vote*, and diſſolved the Committee.

THAT *it is the unanimous Opinion of the* united Miniſters, *upon the Report brought in from the* Committee, *and the further Account of thoſe of the* Committee *preſent, that Mr.* Williams *is entirely clear and innocent of all that was laid to his Charge.*

THIS Vote was entered in their Book, and repeated and agreed to three ſeveral meetings ſucceſſively; and all of the *Committee* who were preſent on any of theſe Days, conſented; *viz.* Dr. *Anneſley*, Mr. *Barker*,

SECT. III.

Barker, Mr. *Hammond*, Mr. *Alſop*, Mr. *Mayo*, Mr. *Stretton*, and Mr. *William Taylor*. This was the iſſue of that affair, after a Search for ſeveral months had been made into my Converſation, to my very Childhood: And I hoped, that the Wiſdom of ſuch, who will be my Adverſaries tho' I wiſh well to them, would keep them ſilent, when I was contented to be ſo for Religion's ſake.

BUT about two Years and a half after this, the *united Miniſters* ſaw occaſion to order a *Committee* to draw up (among other things) a Juſtification of their Vote; which they did at large, and in two or three full meetings it was unanimouſly agreed to, and delivered to be ſafe kept, and ſigned by the *Moderator*: And then their preſent *Committee* was appointed to prepare an abbreviation of it, which when approved of by the Body, a Copy was directed to be ſent to a worthy Perſon, in anſwer to his ſcruples concerning the ſaid Vote, as well as about other matters, which related to the Body of the *united Miniſters*.

OUT of theſe Papers, I ſhall cite a few Paſſages, in anſwer to what is mentioned by Mr. *Criſp*, in one of the ſaid late Pamphlets. The words of the Miniſters are as follow. "You are the *firſt*, (and that after two "Years and a half,) that objected any "thing againſt our clearing Mr. *Williams*, "&c.

" &c. As to what you ſay, of Mr. *Wil-* SECT.
" *liams being rebuked*, you may know, that III.
" the Brother who ſpake to him, (which
" was only about *chafing his Side*,) when
" he came afterwards to underſtand the
" Circumſtances of it, declared in our
" meeting, as he had done formerly to the
" foreſaid *Committee*, (*viz.* that which
" made the Report,) *that Mr.* Williams's
" *having his Side ſo chafed, was ſo far*
" *from being a breach of the Seventh Com-*
" *mandment, that it would have been a*
" *breach of the Sixth Commandment, not to*
" *have done it.* And when it's ſaid, Mr.
" *Williams* was *ſorry for it*, we found,
" it was only from his ſaying *that he was*
" *ſorry* that wicked Perſons had made that
" *wicked uſe of it*; but he ſtill had juſti-
" fied it as lawful, *&c.* And we found,
" that as to Mrs. *Martin* the Nurſe,
" her Teſtimony was diſproved, as far as
" the nature of the thing would bear;
" and that ſuch malice, contradictions, lyes
" and ſlanders were proved againſt her,
" that her Teſtimony deſerved no regard;
" or, to uſe Mr. *Mayo*'s words, *Her Teſ-*
" *timony was not ſufficient to hang a Cat*
" *upon*: And other Teſtimonies to her
" Allegations, there were none. Upon En-
" quiry we found, that what was ſaid
" (in the Report) of *chafing his Side*, as be-
" ing *warned againſt in the Seventh Com-*
" *mandment*, was procured to be put in

by

SECT. III.

" by Mr. *Lobb*, when the Report, as finiſhed, had been read to Mr. *Williams*, " and the *Committee* was riſen, and in a " hurry going away. And we find, that " the utmoſt any of the *Committee* had " pretended, for calling it *an indecent act*, " was, that Mr. *Williams* had, as they " ſaid, (and others denied,) owned, that " ſome time when his diſeaſed Side had " been *chafed* by a woman, and by a man, " it was to the upper part of the Hip, " where the Groin comes furtheſt up. " And enquiring as to his *arreſting* Mr. " *Wheeler*, we found, he muſt have been " diſtracted if he had denied it four days " after he had done it, becauſe the City " did ring thereof; the thing was upon " record, and likely to come to a Trial; " nor was any turn pretended to be ſerved " by his denial of it." This is a ſmall part of the foreſaid Papers.

I TOO much pity the preſent Caſe between the forementioned Mr. *Kuffin* and his Wife, to reply to what the Author of the foreſaid Pamphlet ſaith concerning him; and I dare not improve ſuch things for my defence. Neither deals the Author fairly in his intimation, as if what he calls Mr. *Alſop*'s Reproof to me was *before* the breach at *Pinners-Hall*, (begun in *Auguſt*, and finiſhed *November* 7. 1694.) For neither he, nor I, heard of the foreſaid Aſperſions till ſeveral Weeks after that; tho'

tho' preſently upon it, and the ſetting up of *Salters-Hall* Lecture, a Miniſter ſaid to ſome in a way of advice, *We muſt blacken* Mr. *Williams*; and Reproaches were ſcattered in *December*. To add no more, Mr. *Barker*, (now in Heaven,) Mr. *Hammond*, Mr. *Alſop*, and ſeveral others of *that Committee* have atteſted under their hands, That ſuch groſs lyes and ſlanders were proved againſt Mrs. *Martin*, that her Teſtimony was of no value; and that they intended not by any words in the Report, to charge me with any Laſciviouſneſs or Lying. SECT. III.

OTHER things, I hope, I ſhall never be forced to produce; yea, I am ſorry that I am compelled to ſay even thus much, tho' it be with that care of all men's Reputation, and only to wipe off a Blot from my profeſſion, and to remove impediments to my uſefulneſs, thoſe few Days my God ſhall pleaſe to add to my frail Life. To him I render Glory, that I hope, I truly forgive my greateſt Adverſaries, and wiſh them long Lives, filled with ſervice and comfort; and to them and us a better Spirit, and more Regard to the Intereſt of Chriſt, than to manage our debates, as if all Charity, Truth, and Prudence were loſt among us.

THERE is another Prejudice againſt this Book to be removed; *viz.* what ſome

SECT. III.

talk about *the Names annexed to the Approbation.* In anſwer to this, I think it ſufficient to tranſcribe the following lines out of the *Anſwer to the Report*, agreed to by the *united Miniſters*, pag. 379, 380. where they ſay, "Whatever the "*Reporter* ſaith of the *Scope*, or *Of-*"*fenſiveneſs* of that Book of Mr. *Wil-*"*liams*, called *Goſpel-Truth ſtated*; thoſe "Brethren whom he calls *of biggeſt Name*, "who ſubſcribed the *Firſt Paper*, have "declared, They intended not by that "Paper to *cenſure* the paſſages againſt "which the *Diſſenters* objected; but were "ſo far from condemning any paſſage "therein, that they ſubſcribed the *Firſt* "*Paper*, becauſe they were ſure, that "upon enquiry it would appear, there "was nothing in that Book of Mr. *Wil-*"*liams* contrary to the Senſe of that *Firſt* "*Paper*: And they ſtill, as well as for-"merly, declare it is *an uſeful Book*, and "that it is *the cauſe of Truth* it pleads; "and have given it under their hands, "that the *State of Truth and Error* is "not at all enlarged or changed, ſince they "firſt ſubſcribed; nor did they mean ſo "in the *Firſt Paper*, but only, that there "were in the Book, beſides the *State of* "*Truth and Error*, ſeveral Explications "and Arguments added thereunto. Nor "indeed, could the *State of Truth and* "*Error* be enlarged and changed, becauſe

(as

" (as it is atteſted by ſeveral, even of thoſe Sixteen, who were the firſt that ſubſcribed to the firſt Edition,) the Book, as far as it contained the *State of Truth and Error*, was printed before they ſubſcribed the Atteſtation. Nor do we know of any of the Subſcribers of that Atteſtation, who do diſallow the ſaid Book; nor any, whoſe Names are affixed thereto without their conſent." Having cited the Brethren's words, I ſhall add, I am well aſſured, that Reverend Brother who was oft talked of, as having ſaid he had not read this Book, hath ſince read it, and greatly approveth thereof. SECT. III.

I THINK it not inconvenient here to give a ſhort *Summary* of my decried *Principles*, for the ſake of ſuch as will govern their *Cenſures* by reading little more than other mens falſe account thereof: And yet leſt any might ſuſpect they were more unſound, when ſuch violent outcries were made againſt them, I ſhall tranſcribe a Paper, which I ſent by Mr. *Edmund Harriſon* to a general meeting of the Subſcribers to the Lecture at *Pinners-Hall*, which he read publickly to them before the unhappy *Breach* in the ſaid Lecture; *a faithful* account whereof, with other matters of Fact, would greatly diſadvantage them for whoſe ſake *the Hiſtory of the Union* was lately written. But a Concern for our

SECT. III. common intereſt and quiet, allows me only to ſay, I was induſtrious to prevent that Breach, and willing to *condeſcend* to any thing, except ſinning againſt my Conſcience, by a voluntary receſs after God had placed me in that Lecture by a deciſive *Lot*, which I durſt not diſregard; and by giving way to what would be interpreted the publick Triumph of *Antinomian Errors* over the Truths preached in that place, not only by me, but by Dr. *Bates*, Mr. *Howe*, Mr. *Alſop*, yea, and Mr. *Mead*, whoſe Miniſtry is now exclaimed againſt by many of the ſame impetuous men, as *Legal*, *Arminian*, *&c.* Nor can men forget, that the main point Mr. *Cole* oppoſed, was the *neceſſity of Repentance* to the forgiveneſs of ſin, which Dr. *Bates* had aſſerted in a practical diſcourſe; after which, that Reverend man (now in the glorious regions of light and love,) excited by more deſigning perſons, could ſcarce in any Sermon for a long time forbear breaking out againſt us.

The Paper is as follows.

" NOTWITHSTANDING any hard-
" ſhips I have endured, the miſrepreſen-
" tation of my Principles, my Innocency
" as to having ever deſigned by any wri-
" ting to expoſe the Congregational par-
" ty, or all their Miniſters as ſuch, which
" I ſolemnly diſown: And that I well
" know, I never uſed any *Reflections* in

" the

" the only three Controverſial diſcourſes, SECT.
" which I was ſo exceedingly forced to III.
" preach at *Pinners-Hall:* Nevertheleſs,
" to prevent Sin, Scandal, and great dan-
" ger to the Diſſenters, which may fol-
" low a *Breach*; I am willing to join with
" Mr. *Cole*, in ſubſcribing the following
" Declaration, and Doctrinal Articles; and
" ſhall bleſs God, if it may prove an ex-
" pedient.

" THO' there may be ſome leſſer diffe-
" rences between us, yet we account theſe
" following *Principles*, a ground of agree-
" ment notwithſtanding any paſt debates;
" and of encouragement to each other's
" Miniſtry; being *ſorry* for any miſap-
" prehenſions of each other's Doctrine,
" and any indecent reflections on either
" the Miniſtry or perſon of one another,
" whether in Diſcourſe, Sermons, or
" Print; *reſolving* for the future to a-
" void all irritating *diſputes* in our Ser-
" mons. And we heartily deſire our
" reſpective Friends, to lay aſide thoſe
" prejudices, heats, diſtances, and re-
" proaches, which ſo diſhonour our Re-
" ligion, hinder Edification, tend to our
" common Hurt, gratify our Enemies,
" grieve the Spirit of God, as well
" as all ſerious Chriſtians, and much
" obſtruct the uſefulneſs of our Mi-
" niſtry. Laſtly, As we ſhall truly en-
" deavour to *keep the unity of the Spi-*

SECT. III.

" *rit in the bond of Peace*, ſo we ſhall " pray for each other, and bleſs God, if he " ſhall pleaſe to diſappoint Satan's deſign " by, and hopes from, the afflictive Con- " tentions, which have ſo long continued " in this place.

" THE Doctrinal Principles follow, " which I affirm as my Judgment in all " my Books, and am ready to ſubſcribe " with Mr. *Cole*. (1.) God has eternal- " ly *elected* a certain definite number of " men, whom he will *infallibly ſave by* " *Chriſt*, in that way preſcribed by the " Goſpel. (2.) Theſe very *Elect* are not " *perſonally juſtified*, until they receive " Chriſt, and yield up themſelves to him; " but they remain condemned, whilſt " unconverted to Chriſt. (3.) By the " Miniſtry of the Goſpel, there's *a ſerious* " *offer* of Pardon and Glory upon the " *terms* of the Goſpel, to all that hear it; " and God thereby *requires* them to com- " ply with the ſaid terms. (4.) Miniſters " ought to uſe theſe, and other Goſ- " pel-benefits, as *motives*; aſſuring men, " that *if they believe, they ſhall be juſtified*; " *if they turn to God, they ſhall live*; *if* " *they repent, their ſins ſhall be blotted out*; " and whilſt they *neglect* theſe duties, they " can't have a perſonal *intereſt* in theſe re- " ſpective benefits. (5.) It is by the " Power of *the Spirit of Chriſt* freely ex- " erted, and not by the Power of *free-*

" *will*,

" *will*, that the Goſpel becomes *effectual* SECT.
" for the converſion of any Soul to the III.
" Obedience of Faith. (6.) When a
" man believes, yet is not that very *Faith*,
" and much leſs any other work, the
" matter of that Righteouſneſs *for which*
" a Sinner is *juſtified*; that is, entitled to
" Pardon, to Acceptance as righteous, and
" to eternal Glory, *before God:* And it is
" the *imputed Righteouſneſs* of Chriſt a-
" lone, *for which* the Goſpel gives the Be-
" liever a Right to theſe and all ſaving
" bleſſings, who in this reſpect is *juſtified*
" *by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs alone.* By both
" *this* and the *5th head* it appears, that *all*
" *boaſting is excluded*, and we are *ſaved*
" *by free Grace.* (7.) It is *Faith alone*,
" that receives the Lord Jeſus and his
" Righteouſneſs; and the ſubject of this
" Faith is *a convinced penitent Soul*: Hence
" we are *juſtified by Faith alone*, and yet
" the *impenitent* are not forgiven. (8.)
" God has freely promiſed, that all whom
" he *predeſtinated* to Salvation, ſhall not
" only ſavingly believe, but that he by
" his Power will preſerve them from *a*
" *total or a final Apoſtacy.* (9.) Yet the
" Believer whilſt he lives in this world, is
" to *paſs the time of his ſojourning here*
" *with fear*, becauſe his warfare is not ac-
" compliſhed; and that it is true, *if he*
" *draw back, God will take no pleaſure in*
" *him*; which, with the like cautions,

SECT. III.

" God bleſſeth as means to *the Saints perſeverance*; and theſe by Miniſters ſhould " be ſo urged. (10.) The Law of Innocency, *or the Moral Law*, is ſo in force " ſtill, as that every *Precept* thereof conſtitutes Duty even to the Believer; every *Breach* thereof is a Sin deſerving " death; and this Law binds death by *its curſe* on every unbeliever: And the " *Righteouſneſs* for or by which we are " *juſtified before God*, is a Righteouſneſs " *(at leaſt) adequate* to that Law, which " is *Chriſt's alone Righteouſneſs*; and this " is *ſo imputed* to the Believer, as that " God deals judicially with him according " thereto. (11.) Yet ſuch is the *Grace* " *of the Goſpel*, that it promiſeth in and " by Chriſt a freedom from the Curſe, " forgiveneſs of Sin, and eternal Life to " every ſincere Believer; which Promiſe " God will certainly perform, *notwithſtanding* the threatning of the Law."

THIS is a faithful account of my *Principles*: And tho' the Propoſal including them, was ineffectual to divert thoſe who were reſolved to publiſh an end to the *Union* by breaking that Lecture; yet I will declare, that as I never reflected on Mr. *Cole*, or any other, in that Pulpit, ſo I am ſorry for that expreſſion, of *his myſterious Nonſenſe*, which is in my Preface to *Man made Righteous*. Nor had I been ſo ſharp, but that juſt before my writing that

Preface

Preface he had preached in a publick Faſt, SECT. III. "that the Subſcribers to my Book were "*Enemies of all Righteouſneſs, and Chil-*"*dren of the Devil*, &c." And yet I wiſh, I had omitted that paſſage, and reſtrained an angry return to that provocation; as by the Grace of God I have been enabled to do, under many greater offences.

SECT. IV.

A Reply to ſome other Objections.

THERE is ſomewhat deſerves a Reply in an *Anonymous Book*; the Author, I ſuppoſe Mr. *Lobb*, or a ſmall Inſtrument of his; the Title, *A Confutation of ſome of Mr.* Williams's *Errors, by Mr.* Alſop, *in a Letter to Mr.* Burgeſs. SECT. IV.

IT is not worth while to blame the *publiſhed Title*; tho' Mr. *Alſop* wrote no ſuch Letter, knew not of it, yea, abhorred it: Nor to detect the Story of Mr. *Sylveſter*; who declares, "Mr. *Baxter* "told him, that the managers of *Pin-*"*ners-Hall* Lecture deſired him, that I "might always preach in that Lecture "when he was diſabled:" And I am ſure, I never requeſted it of Mr. *Baxter*

or

SECT. IV.

or any other, and the foreſaid managers deſired it of me: Yea, Mr. *Baxter*, and ſome of them preſſed me to be the *ſtated Lecturer* during his Life, which I refuſed; tho' after his death my Election was oppoſed as far as poſſible by many of them, becauſe of that part of my Sermon which is in the *Appendix* at the end of *Goſpel-Truth*. The only pretence I know for this Author's Story, is, that being one Evening with Mr. *Baxter*, who fearing he ſhould be unable to preach next day at *Pinners-Hall*, I deſired him to reſolve to do it, and if he found himſelf in the morning too weak, I would ſupply his place for that turn.

BUT I ſhall briefly conſider an Objection or two, againſt my Books, the reſt being anſwered already.

Obj. 1. *The threatning of the Law was Eternal Death, as Eternal: Eternity was an ingredient in the miſery of every Sinner.* Man made Righteous, *pag.* 16.

Anſw. IF this be an Error, why do our Divines make Eternal Death one *Species* of the Death threatned by the Law? But I have further Reaſons to fear, that ſome prime Authors of this Charge believe *Origen*'s Notion, and of late deny the Eternal duration of the Torments of the damned.

Obj.

SECT. IV.

Obj. 2. *That Legal Preaching which is a Crime, is to preach the Law as a Covenant of works. Every Threatning uſed by God to Converſion, is a Goſpel-Threatning.* Goſpel-Truth, *pag.* 243, 145.

Anſw. 1. I HAVE been branded as a *Legal Preacher*, and yet it ſeems, I am not Legal Preacher enough: But peruſe the places; and ſee *pag.* 245. where I explain his *firſt Clauſe*, and ſay, "The "blameable *Legal Preaching* is to preach "duties or holineſs, as if men muſt perfectly believe and obey, or they ſhall *unavoidably periſh*; and to denounce wrath "and hell, as miſeries, from which there "is *no relief by Chriſt.*" And my words, in *pag.* 145. (which his *ſecond Clauſe* cites,) are, "Moſt of the promiſes and "threatnings in the Bible, that refer to "the ſtate of Souls, are *evangelical* pro"miſes and threats; they are not the "Sanctions of the Law of Innocence, but "of Goſpel-grace;" Which words (ſo falſely quoted by him,) are an Argument to prove, that there be *Goſpel-Threatnings.*

Anſw. 2. BY denying that the *Covenant of works* ought to be preached, I could not mean, that it ſhould not be explained; or that all men ſhould not be informed, that they were condemned thereby; For my affirming, that the Elect remain

SECT. IV.

main in a condemned State before God till they believe, is what offends them; as alſo my ſaying, that this is a fit Argument to incline men to obey the Goſpel; (which makes it a Goſpel-Argument in our Preaching.) But I grant, that *I affirm* and *theſe men deny*, that our offers to Sinners are inforced by *Goſpel-Threatnings*, *viz.* that they ſhall *remain condemned*, and be *more ſorely puniſhed*, if they will not repent and believe; and theſe are urged to perſuade their acceptance of it. Whereas they ſay, *Turn ye, turn ye, why will ye die*, is the Triumph of the Law over dead Sinners: And they are for no threatnings or precepts, but thoſe of the *Law of works*, which they thus accommodate: *If you ſin, you ſhall die*, that is, you or your Surety: *If you obey, you ſhall live*, that is, you or your Surety. And thus with them *the Goſpel Preaching is*, Your Surety hath died, and obeyed, and all this you have done already in him: and if you *believe this*, you ſhall know that it was ſo: But you incur no danger by *not believing*, but that it will not be evident to your *own Conſcience*, that you have thus ſuffered and obeyed in Chriſt. And ſo you have their Legal, and their Goſpel Preaching.

Obj. 3. *What is the Covenant of Grace? In Anſwer he ſaith, By Covenant of Grace, I mean the way that God hath ordained,*

to

to apply to Sinners that Salvation which is prepared by Chriſt, and which he will enable the Elect to comply with. Goſpel-Truth, *pag.* 59, 60. And telling us, *This is* my deſcription *of the Covenant of Grace*, he blames my want of accuracy in *Logick*, being I mention neither the *Genus* of the thing *defined*, nor the *ſpecifick difference*, or what is proper to a Covenant of Grace. SECT. IV.

Anſw. 1. IT ſeems, a *definition* and *deſcription* is the ſame with him: But with his leave, if you ſee *pag.* 59, 60. you will find, that between my *Queſtion* and this *Anſwer*, I ſpeak at large, that *it is not the Covenant of Redemption.* In the next words, I deſcribe the *Conditions* of the Covenant of Grace; from thence to *pag.* 62. And then I ſhew the *ſpecifick difference* between the Covenant of *Works*, and that of *Grace*, *pag.* 63, 64. and at the end of theſe Preliminaries, *I give a deſcription* of the Covenant of Grace. But what he calls *my deſcription*, is only deſigned to give the *difference* between the Covenant of *Redemption*, and what *I call* the Covenant of *Grace*, *viz.* the ordained way of *Application* of ſaving benefits, as oppoſed to the way of their *Impetration.*

Anſw. 2. I WRITE to *explain Truth* to ordinary Readers; and had I been concerned for the praiſe of Skill in *Logick*, Dr. *Bates* had not kept back my Anſwer to Mr. *Lobb*'s Letter; wherein I ſhew the falſeneſs

SECT. IV. falſeneſs of his two *vulgar Axioms* about disjunctive Propoſitions, and prove, (1.) *Partes propoſitionis disjunctivæ non ſunt ſemper oppoſitæ, ſed aliquando ſolummodo diverſæ, & equidem ſubordinatæ; & quamquam aliquando ſit ridiculum loqui disjunctivè cum poſſumus copulativè, at non ſemper ridiculum.* (2.) *Ad veritatem affirmatæ disjunctivæ propoſitionis non neceſſe eſt, ut unica tantum pars ſit vera; poteſt enim affirmata eſſe vera ex ambabus, pluribus, omnibus, partibus veris.* Vid. Eccl. xi. 6. Col. ii. 16.

Anſw. 3. I'LL here inform another, that as no *umbræ* did inſert a word in *Goſpel-Truth*, ſo its *Learning* is not leſs, for wanting *Latin Quotations*, when the words of the *Aſſembly*, and of *Independents*, were likelier to be regarded by the *Criſpians*; nor for omitting *Phyſical terms* in the Doctrine of Juſtification, which is a *forenſic* act, where the meriting conſideration for which the judicial Sentence paſſeth, is as a *material Cauſe*.

OUR *Catechiſm* puts it ſo; *Juſtification is an act of God's free Grace, wherein he pardoneth all our Sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his ſight, only for the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, imputed to us, and received by Faith alone.* Here the *Form* of God's juſtifying act is, his *pardoning* our Sins, and *accepting* us as righteous; the *meriting Cauſe* is, the only *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed:*

imputed: Which expreſsly anſwers to this Queſtion, *For the ſake of what*, as the meritorious Cauſe, are Pardon and Acceptance adjudged to us by that juſtifying act? The word [*imputed*] not only ſhews, that unleſs Chriſt's Righteouſneſs were imputed, God could not pardon and accept us for it; but alſo aſſigns the *Reaſon*, why God for it *juſtifies us* and not *others*, and *now* and not *before*; tho' it hath a meriting value to juſtify *others*, and us *before* this time: The next words tell us, *to whom*, and *when*, theſe benefits are adjudged; *viz.* to ſuch as have this Righteouſneſs *imputed to them*, and when it is *received by Faith*. We ſee, that *Righteouſneſs* even *imputed*, is with the *Aſſembly*, only the meritorious Cauſe *for which* God forgives, and accepts us; ſuitably to *Rom.* iii. 24. *We are juſtified thro' the Redemption that is in Chriſt*; that is, for the ſake of Chriſt's redeeming Blood, as the *meriting price*, unleſs men deny *Redemption by price*. And they cannot mean, that imputing Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is the *Form* of God's juſtifying act, (nor conſequently, of our paſſive Juſtification,) unleſs pardoning our Sins be *formally* the Imputation of the Righteouſneſs, for the ſake of which when imputed he pardoneth; which true Senſe, and the formal notion of *Forgiveneſs*, contradict; no, nor will *Acceptance as righteous* admit it. Yea, with them an imputing act is *ſuppoſed*, to this

SECT. IV.

SECT. IV. this juſtifying act *here* defined; of which elſewhere.

BUT if they be ſuppoſed to intend, with the *French* Church in the Synod of *Rochel*, That *the whole obedience of Chriſt both in his Life and Death, is imputed to us for the full Remiſſion of our ſins and acceptance unto eternal Life*; it is what our Author weakly decries, as an Imputation only *as to effects*. For if he mean by *quoad formam*, that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs *itſelf*, and not the effects, is imputed, I grant it; for it is *itſelf* imputed, *relatively* to that pardon and acceptance, and is our pleadable Security; *itſelf* is ſo, and is *imputed* to be ſo: Nor is it leſs than ridiculous, that I muſt deny it, becauſe it is *effectual* for our pardon and acceptance; unleſs he deny, that pardon and acceptance can be the *effects* of that Righteouſneſs of Chriſt which is imputed. But he muſt mean by the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, that God *reputes* and *judicially* pronounceth *us* to have performed that Righteouſneſs; that is, that *we obeyed* the Law, *and died*, which was accepted for Satisfaction for our ſins, and merited Life; which I have ſpoken to, and the *Aſſembly* never could intend.

AND if it be *objected*, that they ſay, *God accepteth us as righteous in his ſight, for the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed to us*: I anſwer, God *adjudgeth us* when believers,

believers, to be dealt with *as* righteous persons, being we are pardoned upon Christ's *satisfaction* and intitled to happiness *in his right*, whose obedience and satisfaction are judicially *accounted* our pleadable Security for both. But though we are to be thus *dealt with* for the sake of *Christ's obedience*; they cannot intend, that God accounts *us to have obeyed* in Christ: For that is contradicted in his *pardoning our sins*, unless we can in the *same* sentence be legally adjudged to need a Pardon *as Sinners*, and yet be legally accounted *no Sinners* as having *always obeyed*. Nay, if we obeyed in Christ, because the Law saith, *If thou or thy Surety obey, thou shalt live*, we could not, *for our own sins*, be obliged to punishment by its *threatning*; no, though Christ had not died; and so Pardon and Satisfaction are needless: For this Law was so *fulfilled*, that the Reward became due by our *obeying in Christ*, notwithstanding *our own sin*; unless we need Satisfaction and Pardon when we are *entitled to the Reward*; which is impossible, both by the *nature* of that Reward, for a *right to Life* hinders a liableness to *die*; and by the *merit* of it, unless *perfect obedience* consist with *disobedience*. And do not say, *We sinned*, but *Christ obeyed*: For if *our obeying in him* makes the *Reward* due to us, our *not obeying* ourselves did not *forfeit* it, nor

SECT. IV.

SECT. IV. consequently incur the *penalty* by that Law.

Answ. 4. I PITY the weakness of these men, who, when their noise is about *Justification*, tell the world, we are therein *Amyraldians*; whereas *Amyraldus* was so exactly *Calvinistical* in this point, that the last Synod of *Charenton* appointed him to defend the *Protestant* Doctrine of Justification against *Milletiere*: (Yea, *Arminius* was professedly so too:) But his offending notions respected the Divine Will, Decrees, subjective Grace, and the extent of Christ's Death; Though the *last* was not condemned by the *French* Church, and is owned by *Davenant*, *Usher*, &c. Nay, see Mr. *Lobb* in his *Glory of free Grace*, pag. 66, 67. proving, *That the Salvation of every man is become possible, by Christ's satisfying Divine Justice by his Death.*

I SHALL conclude with this Apology, for continuing the Name of Mr. *Ferguson* before this Book. When he was pleased to give his Name to the *Second Edition*, he appeared to be an *Ecclesiastick*, (though not *in Socks and Buskins*;) and though he now think it fit to lay aside *that Character*, yet I remove not his Name; hoping his present intimacy with Mr. *Lobb*, his zeal for *Independency*, and warmth against *Presbyterian* Discipline, may reconcile the most offended to a Book, as far as he approves of it.

IN

In the bowels of Christ I humbly beseech all Contenders, to secure the aptitude of the Ministry to promote practical Religion, and so to manage our Debates, as that we may reflect with inward peace, if the *Calamities of our French Brethren* should become our Lot. SECT. IV.

The END *of the* FOURTH VOLUME.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM